

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

JOSÉ ROBLES

HAZELTON SPENCER

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
GRANT, E. M.—Victor Hugo and the Doctrine of the Right to Work, -	71
LANCASTER, H. C.—Lope's 'Peregrino,' Hardy, Rotrou, and Bays, -	75
MERITT, HERBERT.—An OE. Gloss: 'Ober Eliman, Innannorum,' -	77
YOUNG, KARL.—A Note on Chaucer's Friar, -	83
TRAIN, LILLA.—Chaucer's 'Ladies Foure and Twenty,' -	85
CHAPPELL, L. W.—Another "Canterbury Tale," -	87
CASSIDY, F. G.—Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in 'Beowulf,' -	88
DuBOIS, A. E.—Beowulf, 489-490, -	89
BAUGH, A. C.—The Chronology of French Loan-Words in English, -	90
KRUMPELMANN, J. T.—Hoodlum, -	93
WITHINGTON, ROBERT.—"Water Fastand," -	95
REEVES, W. P.—A Second MS. of Wyclif's 'De Dominio Civili,' -	96
THOMPSON, D. W.—Belphegor in 'Grim the Collier' and Riche's 'Farewell,' -	99

## REVIEWS:—

C. J. SHARP and MAUD KARPELES (eds.), English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians; E. B. GREENLEAF and G. Y. MANSFIELD (eds.), Ballads and Sea Songs of Newfoundland. [A. K. Davis, Jr.] -	102
G. SCHÜTTE, Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations. [K. Malone.] -	106
L. L. SCHÜCKING, Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. [S. Einarsson.] -	108
J. L. LOWES, Geoffrey Chaucer and the Development of his Genius. [R. A. Pratt.] -	111
W. O. WEHRLE, The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature. [M. Henshaw.] -	113
E. K. CHAMBERS, The English Folk-Play. [Grace Frank.] -	114
H. E. ROLLINS (ed.), Brittons Bowre of Delights, 1591. [E. A. Strathmann.] -	115
C. L. DAY (ed.), The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey. [N. Ault.] -	118
H. V. ROUTH, The Nineteenth Century and After. [A. E. DuBois.] -	119
F. E. RATCHFORD and W. C. DE VANE (eds.), Legends of Angria. Compiled from the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. [P. D. Proctor.] -	121
T. ABELE und M. J. BÖHNERT (eds.), Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten; W. SILZ (ed.), German Romantic Lyrics; M. SOMMERFELD (ed.), Romantische Lyrik; J. PETERSEN und E. TRUNZ (eds.), Lyrische Weltedichtung in deutschen Übertragungen an 7 Jahrhunderten. [E. Feise.] -	123
A. JEANROY, La Poésie lyrique des Troubadours. [Grace Frank.] -	126
W. VON WARTBURG, Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois. [R. Levy.] -	128
M. K. POPE, From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman. [R. Levy.] -	130
A. TILLEY, Three French Dramatists, Racine, Marivaux, Musset. [J. P. Mason.] -	131
L. H. SKINNER, Collin d'Harleville Dramatist. [M. Baudin.] -	133
E. EGGLI et P. MARTINO (eds.), Le Débat romantique en France, 1813-1830. [D. H. Carnahan.] -	134
BRIEF MENTION: M. M. KNAPPEN (ed.), Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries; C. B. JUDGE, Elizabethan Book-Pirates; I. MAHL, Der Prosastil in den Märchen C. Brentanos; J. J. ELSON (ed.), The Wits; E. E. WILLOUGHBY, The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare; W. JÖRDENS, Die französischen Ödipusdramen; University of Texas Studies in English, -	137

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

## EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,  
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

## ADVISORY EDITORS

G. Chinard, E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00  
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries  
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

## ENGLISH PROSE AND POETRY 1660 1800

### *Shepard--Wood*

- "A landmark in the history of textbooks on the eighteenth century." —  
Harry Hayden Clark, *University of Wisconsin.*
- "Distinctly attractive, economical, up-to-date in its introductions, notes,  
and bibliographies." — Richard A. Rice, *Smith College.*
- "It seems to be a well-chosen and well-edited volume." — H. C. Rollins,  
*Harvard University.*
- "I have examined the book with interest and consider it a good piece of  
work." — Newman I. White, *Duke University.*
- "A masterly volume, this." — Austin Warren, *Boston University.*
- "It seems to me excellent." — E. S. Noyes, *Yale University.*
- "An excellent collection for the period." — John Hawley Roberts,  
*Williams College.*

xl + 1074 pages. \$4.00

===== Houghton Mifflin Company =====

Boston New York Chicago Dallas Atlanta San Francisco

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894







# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume L

FEBRUARY, 1935

Number 2

---

## VICTOR HUGO AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE RIGHT TO WORK

The most penetrating historians of the Second Republic agree that it was doomed from the start because of a fatal conflict among its founders. It was established, on the one hand, by moderates who sought only a political revolution, and, on the other, by radicals who dreamed of a social revolution. The latter, headed by Louis Blanc, forced themselves into the provisional government and wrung from the moderates three important concessions: the famous "guarantee of work,"<sup>1</sup> the setting up of the National Workshops, and the creation of the Commission du Luxembourg.<sup>2</sup>

It is not my intention to retrace the history of these innovations or even to analyze the attitude of Victor Hugo toward all three. Unprepared for even a political revolution—he advocated, as is well known, a regency at the outbreak of the February uprising—he was scarcely likely to favor a radical social upheaval. Logically enough, he joined with moderates and conservatives in condemning the Commission du Luxembourg and the *Ateliers nationaux*, and breathed with them a sigh of relief when the events of May and

<sup>1</sup> The following proclamation was inserted in *Le Moniteur universel* for February 26, 1848:

Le gouvernement provisoire de la République française s'engage à garantir l'existence de l'ouvrier par le travail;

Il s'engage à garantir du travail à tous les citoyens;

Il reconnaît que les ouvriers doivent s'associer entre eux pour jouir du bénéfice légitime de leur travail.

Le Gouvernement provisoire rend aux ouvriers, auxquels il appartient, le million qui va échoir de la Liste civile.

<sup>2</sup> Its official title was *Commission du gouvernement pour les travailleurs*. It sat in the Luxembourg palace, and its purpose was to study ways and means of ameliorating the lot of the workers.

June led to their demise. But concerning the "guarantee of work," an interesting problem has arisen which I wish to discuss in some detail. Before the June insurrection, Hugo remained silent on this issue. After the workers' defeat, he contributed through his paper, *L'Événement*, to the discussion.

The radicals had not given up all hope. Even after the June days they sought to have the "right to work" included in the preamble of the new constitution. The legislative committee had in fact recognized it in the original project presented to the Assembly on June 19. Then came the insurrection, and the committee rewrote the eighth paragraph of the preamble to read as follows:

La République doit protéger le citoyen dans sa personne, sa famille, sa religion, son travail, et mettre à la portée de chacun l'instruction indispensable à tous les hommes; elle doit l'assistance aux citoyens nécessiteux, soit en leur procurant du travail dans les limites de ses ressources, soit en donnant, à défaut de famille, les moyens d'exister à ceux qui sont hors d'état de travailler.<sup>3</sup>

Clearly, the radical *droit au travail* had given way to an expression of mild humanitarianism.

What was Victor Hugo's attitude on this important social question? M. de Lacretelle, describing the poet's votes in the Chamber at this time, says malevolently:

Tous sont dictés par l'esprit conservateur le plus étroit; dans les questions ouvrières et démocratiques, il vote contre l'inscription du droit au travail dans la constitution, et il maintient cette position lorsque Félix Pyat s'efforce une dernière fois de faire mentionner au moins l'existence de ce droit.<sup>4</sup>

The truth of the matter is that Victor Hugo did not vote against the *droit au travail*, and that his attitude was quite different from that ascribed to him by M. de Lacretelle. Let us see exactly what happened.

On September 11, Representative Mathieu (de la Drôme) proposed to amend paragraph 8 to read as follows:

La République doit protéger le citoyen dans sa personne, sa famille, sa

<sup>3</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, August 31, 1848.

<sup>4</sup> P. de Lacretelle, *Vie politique de Victor Hugo*, Paris, Hachette, 1928, p. 95; italics mine.

religion et sa propriété. Elle reconnaît le droit de tous les citoyens à l'instruction, au travail et à l'assistance.<sup>5</sup>

Debate followed during which Ledru-Rollin, Crémieux, and others supported the amendment, de Tocqueville and Duvergier de Hauranne opposed it. On the next day *L'Événement* said:

Bien que M. Ledru-Rollin ait été attentivement écouté, il semble déjà évident que l'opinion de l'Assemblée est celle qu'a soutenue M. Duvergier de Hauranne et que, si le droit au travail est inscrit dans la Constitution, ce sera avec des restrictions qui lui retireront toute portée.

Eh! bien, nous avertissons l'Assemblée, en toute modération et en toute bonne foi, qu'elle se trompera, et qu'en voulant ainsi défendre l'ordre et sauvegarder l'avenir, elle compromettra l'avenir et l'ordre.

That *L'Événement* reflected Victor Hugo's own opinions is admitted by all scholars including M. de Lacretelle.<sup>6</sup>

On September 14, two interesting events occurred. In the first place Lamartine spoke against the amendment and showed himself, on this score at least, to be less liberal than the inspirer of *L'Événement*. The second event was the vote on the proposal of a new version offered by Representative Glais-Bizoin. The new text read:

La République doit protéger le citoyen dans sa personne, sa famille, sa religion, sa propriété, son travail; elle reconnaît le droit de tous les citoyens à l'instruction, le droit à l'existence par le travail et à l'assistance.<sup>7</sup>

Mathieu accepted this version and the amendment was put to vote. It was rejected by 596 to 187. The *Moniteur* lists Victor Hugo as being among those *Absents au moment du vote*, and in the absence of other evidence this must be considered as authoritative. Hugo's reason for not voting I have been unable to discover. It does not necessarily imply disapproval. Pierre Leroux also failed to vote, and Pierre Leroux was an unquestioned supporter of the *droit au travail*. But Hugo's attitude on the question had already been made clear by *L'Événement*, and it was now confirmed by further comment in that paper on September 15. *L'Événement* reported the vote and added:

<sup>5</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, September 12, 1848.

<sup>6</sup> P. de Lacretelle, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

<sup>7</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, September 15, 1848. The vote is recorded on page 2456 of this issue.

Ce droit simple, ce droit naturel, ce droit réellement divin, nous sommes de ceux qui l'ont défendu, s'il a besoin toutefois d'être défendu. Notre conscience nous l'ordonnait.

*L'Événement* then tried to explain the Assembly's action by suggesting that it had voted not so much against the *droit au travail* as against the socialists who supported it.<sup>8</sup>

On September 15, the committee on the constitution, somewhat alarmed by public reaction, brought in a new proposal. Paragraph 8 was to be modified to read:

La République doit, par une assistance fraternelle, assurer l'existence des citoyens nécessiteux, soit en leur procurant du travail dans la limite de ses ressources, soit en donnant des secours à ceux qui sont hors d'état de travailler.<sup>9</sup>

This version satisfied many, including Lamartine and even the editors of *Le National*.<sup>10</sup> It was carried by a *viva voce* vote without a rollcall. *L'Événement* expressed its editorial satisfaction:

Ainsi l'intention de l'Assemblée apparaît désormais évidente et claire aux esprits les plus défiant. La promesse est enregistrée, la pierre d'attente est posée. Dès qu'on pourra le faire sans péril, le droit saint au saint devoir du travail sera écrit dans la loi comme il est écrit dans les cœurs.

Doubtless Hugo shared this view—naïve, if you will, but widespread at the time—, and doubtless that is the reason why he failed to support Félix Pyat when the latter raised the question again just before the final adoption of the constitution.<sup>11</sup>

What is to be concluded from these facts? Apart from the matter of misjudgment on Lacretelle's part, the problem throws light on Hugo's social philosophy in August and September 1848. That he was no radical was shown by his speech on the *Ateliers nationaux*.<sup>12</sup> But that he was no reactionary must be admitted, for on this issue of the right to work he ignored the warning of *Le*

<sup>8</sup> An interesting interpretation of this vote was made by the editor of *Le National* who said in the issue of September 15: "L'amendement de M. Glais-Bizoin a été rejeté à une forte majorité; mais on en a repoussé plutôt la rédaction que le sentiment." It shows that Hugo was not the only one deceived by the tactics of a conservative majority.

<sup>9</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, September 16, 1848.

<sup>10</sup> See its editorial printed in the issue of September 16, 1848.

<sup>11</sup> See *L'Événement*, November 2-3, 1848.

<sup>12</sup> Delivered on June 20, 1848.

*Constitutionnel* that "le droit au travail ne peut être que le communisme,"<sup>13</sup> he dissociated himself from de Falloux, de Montalembert, and company, and did not fear to join with Crémieux, Mathieu, Raspail, and even Proudhon. He was in fact a liberal who, while condemning extreme socialist measures and all violent methods, believed in the amelioration of society through piece-meal reform. It was, of course, illogical of him to condemn the *Ateliers nationaux* in June and to support the right to work in September, but to such inconsistencies liberalism seems to be forever addicted.<sup>14</sup>

ELLIOTT M. GRANT

Smith College

### LOPE'S PEREGRINO, HARDY, ROTROU, AND BEYS

Suggestions hitherto made in regard to the sources of Hardy's *Lucrèce* (pub. 1628), Rotrou's *Céliane* (pub. 1637, but probably first played in 1631-2), and Beys's *Hôpital des fous* (pub. 1635) are either negligible or have accounted for little more than a title or an isolated passage.<sup>1</sup> I have recently discovered that the chief source of Hardy's tragedy, that of Beys's tragi-comedy, and a partial source of *Céliane* are to be found in Lope's romantic novel, *El Peregrino en su patria*, first published in 1604 and made known to French authors by d'Audiguier ten years later, when he brought out a translation of it entitled *Les diverses fortunes de Panfile et de Nise*.

Hardy dramatized a story intercalated into the main plot of Lope's novel (pp. 21-7 in the edition of 1733), keeping all of its important events and, except for their Gallic endings, the names of the five leading persons, Telémaco, Lucrecia, Mireno, Everardo,

<sup>13</sup> *Le Constitutionnel*, July 18, 1848.

<sup>14</sup> The research for this article was made possible by a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, I, 48, 503, 553. Pui-busque asserted that *Lucrèce* came from a *novela* of Cervantes and Beys's play from Diego de Torres, who flourished in the eighteenth century! Rigal found no source for Hardy's play. I pointed out that, while Beys may have derived the title of his work from Lope's *El hospital de los locos* (*Los Locos de Valencia*), he could have received only minor suggestions from the plot of that play.



and Erifila.<sup>2</sup> He put into dialogue and into action scenes that had been described or suggested by Lope, made of Erifila a prostitute, enlarged the rôle of the heroine's servant, and added her husband's page in order that there might be someone on the stage at the end of the play. To Lope's influence may be credited the romantic atmosphere of the tragedy, the rapidity of the action, and the technical carelessness shown in the failure to indicate the fate of Erifila, but he is not responsible for the coarseness of the lovers' conversations, which must be due either to Hardy's taste or to that of his audience.

The facts that the hero and heroine of *Céliane* are named Pamphile and Nise, those of Lope's novel Panfilo and Nisa, and that in each case the heroine, disguised as a man, is wounded by a person who is devoted to her—her brother in Lope, her lover in Rotrou—suggest that Rotrou was influenced by Lope's novel, although it cannot be considered his main source, since the *Peregrino* contains no equivalents for the two most important motifs in the French play, the hero's effort to give the woman he loves to his benefactor and the trick by which the latter is persuaded to renounce her.

Beys's debt to Lope is much more important than Rotrou's, but less so than that of Hardy. The plot of *l'Hôpital des fous* is in the main that of *El Peregrino*,<sup>3</sup> but a number of Lope's episodes are

<sup>2</sup> In each case the strangely-named Lucrecia commits adultery with Mireno while her husband sleeps, the lover escapes by a rope-ladder, the husband, awaking, thinks he has heard robbers; Everardo seeks in vain to break up the *liaison*; Erifila informs Telémaco of it in the hope that he will guard his wife and Mireno return to her; Telémaco makes the lovers believe he has left town and returns in time to kill them in each other's arms; Everardo avenges his friend by slaying Telémaco.

<sup>3</sup> As in Lope, a young nobleman elopes with a girl, is captured by brigands, is condemned to death, and is spared at the last moment; the girl, thinking her lover dead, temporarily loses her mind, thus escaping the attentions of her captors' leader, and is placed in the insane asylum at Valencia, where she is discovered by her lover, who then pretends to be mad in order to be with her in this establishment. Her brother, seeking revenge, goes to the hero's home, falls in love with the latter's sister, takes her to France, kills a Frenchman in a duel, and is obliged to return to Spain without the woman he loves, who is brought back by another person. Both couples are finally united. There is also in both works a subordinate episode in which the hero of the work is loved by the sister of a man whom he has rescued from his enemies and who has in turn befriended him.

omitted, the names of the characters are changed, and the action now takes place in twenty-four hours and entirely within Valencia. Much of the first two acts and portions of the others are fairly close to the novel, but Beys makes very considerable alterations in order to increase the comic element and to work out his dénouement in a less perfunctory manner than Lope had done. It is true that the Spaniard had introduced into his novel three madmen—a soldier, a philosopher, and an astronomer,—but Beys, taking the hint, increased the number of the episodic madmen to six and made both them and their keeper comic. These amplifications make two scenes of the first act and most of the third almost entirely original. He also introduced so much new material into the last two acts that they bear little resemblance to the novel. While his borrowing from Lope is obvious enough, he is an independent imitator and it was in all probability his alterations rather than his imitations that made his play successful, for, when he rewrote it some seventeen years later (*les Illustres Fous*, played about 1651), he enlarged the comic element and sacrificed the romantic to a still greater extent.

*El Peregrino* seems to have been the first of Lope's works to influence a French dramatist. That three of them should turn to it independently shows that the novel, at least in translation, was well known in France. The fact that Hardy imitated it gives a new reason for dating *Lucrèce*, as I have done, 1615-1625, and makes it possible to say that we now know the sources of all of Hardy's extant tragedies. That the novel should have attracted Rotrou's attention is not surprising in view of the considerable use that the French dramatist made of Lope's plays, but, as in Beys's work no such influence had been detected except in the title of his *Hôpital des fous*, it is interesting to discover that he, too, owed much of his most successful play to the inventive Spaniard.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

AN OE. GLOSS: OBER ELIMAN.INNANNORUM

The puzzling gloss (or glosses) *Ober eliman.innannorum*, an explanation of which is here suggested, occurs in three Latin manuscripts in a section dealing with the interpretation of words

lapides modici quasi harena. Cocyti. fluuius Inferni.  
 pars  
 Ober eliman.<sup>1</sup> Innannorū. Lacerto. pras brachii. i. musi.

arena.Cocithi.fluuius infeni.Ober eliman.innannorum.\*Lacertos.  
pars brachii.

lulus  
rena.Cocyt' fluiui' inferni.Ober eliman inan  
miusi.  
norum.<sup>3</sup>Lacertos.

<sup>1</sup> In the MS. there is but little space between the *r* and the following *e*, as the final stroke of *r* nearly touches *e*.

<sup>2</sup> The letters *nnann* are written over an erasure.

<sup>a</sup> *um* in ligature (a stroke through the arm of *r*).

<sup>4</sup> 1, 496, 20.

<sup>5</sup> Christian Leydecker, *Über Beziehungen zwischen ahd. und ags. Glossen*, Bonn, 1911, pp. 26 and 64.

<sup>o</sup> These two OE. glosses are cited from Wright-Wülcker, *Vocabularies*, 144, 19 and 16.

<sup>7</sup>He noted that the Leiden Glossary contains the gloss *Coquiton.fluuius infernorum*.

it likely that the letter *s* written above in the Carlsruhe MS. referred originally to some OE. gloss. Shortly afterwards Schlutter called attention to the presence of the same gloss in the Stuttgart MS. and briefly suggested that *Ober eliman.innannorum* is a gloss to the following *lacertos*, that it is Old English, and that in it one should read *oberelin aū innanearm* = *oferelin vel innanearm*.<sup>8</sup> In 1922 Sievers rejected Schlutter's proposed solution and considered the gloss still a puzzle.<sup>9</sup>

It is possible that the two apparent parts, *Ober eliman* and *innannorum*, have no connection with each other, that they were originally written near each other above the line or on the margin, *Ober eliman* as a gloss to *Gilarii*, *innannorum* as a gloss to *inferni* (*infernorum*), and were drawn into the line by a copyist previous to the period of the three MSS. concerned.<sup>10</sup>

I suggest that in *Ober eliman* there has been a transposition of parts similar to the St. Gall MS. reading *vuorm corn*,<sup>11</sup> for *cornwurma*,<sup>12</sup> in the gloss *Uermiculus.vuorm corn* and that it is to be read *lim an obere*<sup>13</sup> 'mud on the shore.' The source of the lemmata *Gilarii* and *Cocyti* is found in Job 21, 33, which in the Vulgate

<sup>8</sup> Zs. f. d. Wortforschung, 14, 190.

<sup>9</sup> *Die ahd. Gl.*, 5, 291, where no solution is attempted. Sievers held Schlutter's suggestion "völlig unglaublich." I can not find it so inept. Both *oferelin* and *innanearm* were thought by Schlutter to be compounds elsewhere undocumented, but the latter is now known to be found in *Leechdoms*, 2, 234, 6. The suggestion, however, that one read *earm* in *orum* and *aū* in *an* is not convincing, and even if one accepted the reconstruction *aū*, its use would be unlikely, the common MS. practice being to express alternatives by *vel* or the corresponding MS. symbol *ʃ*.

<sup>10</sup> The Stuttgart MS., although much later than the other two, is not a copy of either. Cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 5, 291, 35 ff.

f

<sup>11</sup> On p. 8. Also *huuorm corn* in the Carlsruhe MS., fol. 102r; cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 589, 6. The Carlsruhe MS. also shows an odd transposition of parts in the gloss *dur fores dur heras*, 104v; cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 382, 20.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Vermiculus* : *cornwurma*, WW. 117, 31; *Vemiculus* : *cornuurma*, WW. 53, 19; *Muricibus* : *cornwurmum*, OEG. 5141.

<sup>13</sup> For the *b* in *obere* compare the Corpus gloss *margo* : *obr*. The MS. division *ober eliman* is of little value for determining the correct division of the words as abnormal divisions are not infrequent in glosses, for ex-

example: <sup>8</sup>*ua gyrost* for *uagyrost* (*wagrifst*) and *gil dibilegid* for *gildi bilegid*, Carlsruhe MS., fol. 100v.

reads: *Dulcis fuit glareis Cocyti*. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* defines *glarea*: *genus quoddam harenae crassioris ex minutis lapillis constantis, qualis invenitur et in ripis aquarum et in sterilibus terrae locis*. Fitting this definition the gloss to *glarea* in Old English is often *ceosel*.<sup>14</sup> But *glarea* appears also in glosses with a somewhat different interpretation, for example, *terram conpugimenta id est condensa*.<sup>15</sup> Diefenbach<sup>16</sup> cites to *glarea* the Latin gloss *terra tenax, limosa* and among Germanic glosses gives *mergel, leym, ton, erde*. In Napier's *Old English Glosses*<sup>17</sup> occurs *Glarea: Read eorde*. These glosses show an interpretation of *glarea* as something like 'sticky earth.' In this sense it is fitly glossed by OE. *lim*. In general OE. *lim* means 'anything sticky,' 'lime,' 'mortar,' 'cement,' 'gluten.'<sup>18</sup> In the Regius Psalter<sup>19</sup> and in the Lambeth Psalter<sup>20</sup> *lime* renders Latin *limo* which in the Canterbury Psalter<sup>21</sup> is rendered by *lame* & *slim* and which is elsewhere<sup>22</sup> glossed by *laam* 'clay,' 'mud,' 'mire.' In the gloss *linitura .i. liim claam*<sup>23</sup> OE. *lim* stands parallel with *clām* 'mud,' 'mortar,' 'clay.' In the Canterbury Psalter<sup>24</sup> the Latin *lutum platearum* is rendered *þæt fen & lim þæra strate* and here the meaning is plainly 'mud,' 'mire.' A bit of MS. evidence that may be connected with the interpretation that *Gilarii* is glossed by *lim* is the fact that the Stuttgart MS. has above *Cocytus* and following the Latin gloss to *Glarei* the word *lutus*. Perhaps this is a corruption of *luctus* and hence a possible gloss to *Cocytus* but as it stand *lutus* 'mud,' 'clay,' 'slime' may be a gloss to *Glarei*. In one of the earliest English versions of the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Napier, *Old English Glosses*, 2879; 4102; 2, 51; 2, 287.

<sup>15</sup> *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 5, 205, 26.

<sup>16</sup> L. Diefenbach, *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum Mediae et Infimae Aetatis*, Francof., 1857.

<sup>17</sup> 18b, 40.

<sup>18</sup> Hall's *Dictionary*, 3d ed., p. 219.

<sup>19</sup> *Der altenglische Regius-Psalter*, ed. F. Roeder in *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, 18. Psalm 68, 3.

<sup>20</sup> *Der Lambeth-Psalter*, ed. U. Lindelöf in *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, tom. 35. Psalm 68, 3.

<sup>21</sup> *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, ed. F. Harsley in EETS. 92. Psalm 68, 3.

<sup>22</sup> WW. *Vocabularies*, 30, 25. Also *lame* glosses *limo* at Ps. 68, 3 in other OE. glossed psalters.

<sup>23</sup> Carlsruhe MS. cxxxv, fol. 103r; *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 640, 3.

<sup>24</sup> Psalm 17, 43.



Bible the phrase corresponding to *glareis* in the Vulgate in this passage from Job is *the stoonys, ether filthis, of helle* (instead of *filthis* a variant reading has *filthi erthe*)<sup>25</sup> an interpretation quite similar to the one suggested for the passage in question. The additional explanation, *an obere* 'on the shore,' is in keeping with the fact that *glarea* may imply the shore, especially in the group *glareis Cocyti*. In an analogous manner *arena* is glossed in Old High German by *grieze des stades*,<sup>26</sup> and Coverdale<sup>27</sup> translated this portion of Job as *amonge the stones by the broke syde*. To this gloss, *lim an obere*, may refer the letter *s* which in the Carlsruhe MS. stands above the following *innannorum*.<sup>28</sup>

Concerning *innannorum* I agree with Leydecker that in view of the ending *orum* one should take into consideration the gloss to *Cocytus* as it appears in the eighth-century Leiden Glossary: *Coquiton.fluuius infernorum*.<sup>29</sup> While the three MSS. immediately concerned read *fluuius infe(r)ni*, besides the Leiden MS. in the group of MSS. with Old English-Old High German glosses to the Books of the Bible the ninth-century Paris MS. Lat. 2685 reads *Quotiti.fluuius infernorum* (fol. 55v) and the tenth-century Bern MS. 258 reads *Cocyti.fluuius infernorum* (fol. 16r). To the lemma in this form I suggest that *innannorum* was added as a gloss thus, *.i.maniorum*. It is significant that a large number of the glosses in the three MSS. containing the gloss in question are introduced by *.i.* and in some cases this letter is written so close to the following word that only the dot distinguishes it as a separate part. How it might be drawn into the following gloss may be seen in the St. Gall MS. on page 12, *Litura.Ipflaster*.<sup>30</sup> It is not unlikely that an

<sup>25</sup> *The Holy Bible in the Earliest English Versions, Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers*, edited by Forshall and Madden, Oxford, 1850. Unfortunately Aelfric's free rendering of parts of Job does not cover the section concerned.

<sup>26</sup> Graff, *Sprachschatz*, 4, 345.

<sup>27</sup> *The Holy Scriptures Translated by Myles Coverdale*. Reprinted from the copy in the library of the Duke of Sussex for Samuel Bagster, London, 1838.

<sup>28</sup> This letter *s* probably stands for *saxonice*, as it does in connection with other glosses in the MS., for instance *cylli, uiluc besu*.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Hessels, *The Leiden Latin Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, Cambridge, 1906, p. 18. The gloss is preceded in the Leiden MS. by *Glarea.lapides modici*.

<sup>30</sup> Published in *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 640, 1 as *Litura.i.pflaster* but in the

original *.i.maniorum* may have been copied as *innannorum*. Such a corruption arises from the misreading of strokes and is a common cause of variation in words copied from one manuscript into another.<sup>31</sup> That there was some confusion in the reading of strokes in this word appears from the manuscripts, two of which read *innannorum* while the third reads *inannorum*, and in the Carlsruhe MS. the letters *nnann* are over an erasure. *maniorum* is a documented genitive plural of *manes*,<sup>32</sup> which has as one meaning 'infernal regions.'<sup>33</sup> In relation to *infernus* the word occurs in the glosses *manes: inferni*,<sup>34</sup> *manes: inferna*,<sup>35</sup> *manes: inferna uel sepulchra fauillasti maiorum*.<sup>36</sup>

The words *Ober eliman.innannorum* defy interpretation when taken exactly as they stand. The solution here suggested calls for changes which coincide with the peculiarities of the manuscripts concerned. It can not claim finally to solve the puzzle in this group of words, but it attempts from a new point of view the explanation of a problem of long standing.

HERBERT MERITT

Hamilton College

MS. no dot follows the *i*, which is close to the following letter. A similar case is found in the Carlsruhe MS., fol. 100r: *Extentera.i.aperi uentrem eius.iaspidē* (cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 475, 14). The *i* and *a* of *iaspidē* are joined in the MS.; in this case however there is a trace of a dot above and to the right of *i* and it is probable that the gloss should be read *.i.aspidē*. Cf. Schlutter's interpretation of the gloss in *Anglia*, 46, p. 331 and *Englische Studien*, 49, p. 156. In the St. Gall MS. the same sort of error occurs with the symbol *.s.*; the Carlsruhe MS., fol. 102v, reads *Murenulas.s. ciniuiipan* but the St. Gall MS., p. 8, has *sciniuiipant* (cf. *Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 589, 19). In the Leiden Glossary glosses are not infrequently introduced by *.i.* and here there is at least one instance where the dot after *i* is omitted and the *i* stands close to the following letter: *Ligones.ferrum fusorium.ityr-fahga* fol. 26r; xvii, 2 in Hessels' edition.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Carlsruhe MS. reading *sineduma* for *smeduma*, fol. 104r (*Die ahd. Gl.*, 1, 375, 1). For a list of corruptions from the misreading of strokes see Hessels' edition of the *Corpus Glossary*, p. xviii.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil, Leipzig, 1868, v, 196.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Georges, *Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* under *mānēs*.

<sup>34</sup> M108 in Hessels' edition of the *Corpus Glossary*.

<sup>35</sup> *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 4, 536, 9bc.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 4, 112, 44.

## A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S FRIAR

The commentators have expressed some difference of opinion as to the implication of the following lines in Chaucer's characterization of the Friar in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*:

He hadde maad ful many a mariage  
Of yonge women at his owene cost. (A 212-3).

In a pardonable desire to minimize the Friar's bad reputé, one or two have explained these lines as meaning that he had enabled numerous runaway couples to marry without paying fees, or had assumed general responsibility.<sup>1</sup> A more widely accepted interpretation is that this reprobate, at his own expense, had provided for the marriages of sundry young women who had been his concubines.<sup>2</sup> Although this derogatory implication seems to me inescapable, the only historical record adduced in support of it, so far as I know, is a letter of the year 1535 cited long ago by Dr. Furnivall. In this missive to Cromwell, Dr. Layton mentions "an holy father prior" who had seduced a number of girls, "and always mared them ryght well."<sup>3</sup> Although one finds no pleasure in multiplying the misdemeanors of the mediaeval clergy, I offer in elucidation of Chaucer's intention a statement from a prelate of the poet's own century. This document is the following unpublished memorandum of the year 1321 from the register of John de Droghensford, bishop of Bath and Wells:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See E. Flügel, in *Journal of German Philology*, I (1897), 133-5; H. B. Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer*, Northampton, 1907, p. 18. J. S. Brewer, in his edition of *Monumenta Franciscana* [vol. I], London, 1858, p. xl, appears to interpret the Friar's action as being merely an "encouragement of marriage."

<sup>2</sup> See W. W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, v, Oxford, 1900, pp. 25-6; M. H. Liddell, *Chaucer*, New York, 1911, p. 146; J. M. Manly, *Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer*, New York [1928], p. 511; F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston [1933], p. 758.

<sup>3</sup> F. J. Furnivall, *A Temporary Preface to the Six-text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Part I (Chaucer Society, Second Series, no. 3), London, 1868, pp. 117-8, quoting the letter from T. Wright, *Three Chapters of Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries* (Camden Society, xxvi), London, 1843, 58. Skeat (*loc. cit.*) makes full use of this evidence.

<sup>4</sup> The memorandum is described by Bishop Edmund Hobhouse in his *Calendar of the Register of John de Droghensford*, in *Somerset Record*

## MEMORANDUM PRO VICARIO DE WESTBURY.

Memorandum quod coram nobis, I,<sup>8</sup> permissione diuina Bathoniensi et Wellensi Episcopo, in aula manerii nostri de Westbury die Iouis, videlicet quarto Idus Decembris Anno Domini M<sup>o</sup>.CCC<sup>o</sup>.XXI<sup>o</sup>., conparuerunt Ricardus Parker<sup>9</sup> de Westbury et Editha vxor eius de Galfrido vicario de Westbury conquerentes imponendo sibi quod Iulianam filiam dicte Edithe deflorando carnaliter cognouit, et ex ea duas proles suscitauit, ac coram ipsis et aliis amicis dicte mulieris firmiter promisit, vt dicunt, quod ad dicte Iuliane promocionem maritalem pro possibilitate sua iuuaret; quod postea facere non curauit. Demum, vocato dicto vicario, a premissis sibi obiectis fatebatur quod dicta Iuliana ad domum suam sponte sepius accessit, et ex huius accessu ipsam de voluntate sua spontanea tandem carnaliter cognouit, et ex ea duas proles suscitauit, super quibus fuerat per officialem Domini Decani Wellensis iudicium suum in ea parte competentem debite correctus, prout per litteras ipsius officialis tunc exhibitas euidenter apparuit, adiciendo quod dictam Iulianam non deflorauit nec tenuit secum uel alibi, ipsiusque Iuliane maritaggio, vt suggeritur, subuenire non promisit, set quod prefati Ricardus et vxor sua falso et maliciose eum iudicari fecerunt, ac dispendia non modica et obprobria sepius intulerunt et ab aliis sibi fieri nequiter procurarunt, que omnia et singula se optulit litteris<sup>7</sup> probaturum. Habita igitur diutina altercacione super hiis inter ipsas partes, demum predictae partes ordinacioni nostre decreto et laudo alte et basse se submiserunt. Nos itaque de consilio assedencium, pro omni tollenda discordia ac pacis tranquillitate inter ipsas partes confouenda in futurum, ordinauimus et precepimus quod dictus vicarius de sex marcis ad promocionem maritalem dicte Iuliane per dictos Ricardum et Editham vxorem suam procurandam et faciendam caritatiue subueniret soluendo prefatis Ricardo et vxori sue ad opus dicte Iuliane: duas marcas in festo Pasche tunc proximo sequente, et alias duas marcas in festo Pasche anno proximo sequente, ac reliquas duas marcas anno tercio proximo sequente, ita quod dictus Ricardus et vxor sua sint sibi extunc boni et fideles amici, nullumque dispendium sibi inferent uel scandalum aliaquale, nec per alios quoscunque clam uel palam dicto vicario fieri procurabunt. Et si contingat eos talia contra eum committere in posterum inferre uel procurare maliciose et iniuste extunc, soluere teneantur et debeant dicto vicario sex marcas infra tempus supradictum vel tantum tempus subsequens a die quo per dictos Ricardum et vxorem suam aut alterum eorum dispendium uel scandalum infertur aut procuracionem eorum vt predicatur inferri con-

*Society*, I (1887), 166; and this description is referred to H. G. Richardson, in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Third Series, VI (1912), 123.

<sup>8</sup> I] The reference is to Iohannes de Drokensford, the bishop.

<sup>9</sup> Parker] This word is not capitalized, and, as Hobhouse observes (*op. cit.*, p. 166), it may indicate merely that Richard was the bishop's park-keeper.

<sup>7</sup> litteris] Not completely legible.

tingat. Ad que fideliter obseruanda dicti Ricardus et vxor sua tactis sacrosanctis Ewangeliis corporale prestiterunt iuramentum submittendo se cohibicioni nostre ac officialis nostri si eos in aliquo contra ordinacionem nostram prescriptam contrauenire contingat. Presentibus magistris I. Brabazon sacre theologie professore, Ricardo de Thisteldene rectore ecclesie de Lympalesham, Ricardo de Alresford rectore ecclesie de Hoghtoun, Willelmo Beteuille, clericis, et I. de Wamburgh, notario. In cuius rei testimonium presenti memorando sigillum nostrum ad rogatum humilem dicti vicarii duximus apponendum. Datum die, loco et anno predictis.

From this record it appears that a vicar, named Geoffrey, was charged with having broken his promise to provide funds toward a suitable marriage for a certain Juliana, by whom he had had two children. Although he denied the promise of reparation, the vicar acknowledged his abuse of Juliana, and the paternity of the children. After some wrangling with Juliana's parents, he submitted to the bishop's award requiring him to pay six marks, in instalments, as an aid to the injured girl toward arriving at an appropriate marriage.

This incident would seem to illustrate clearly enough what Chaucer probably meant by the Friar's having arranged marriages of young women "at his owene cost."

KARL YOUNG

*Yale University*

---

### CHAUCER'S *LADYES FOURE AND TWENTY*

An element added by Chaucer in the Wife of Bath's Tale to the popular tale of the knight and the loathly lady is what appears to be a fairy induction,<sup>1</sup> the description of the ladies whom the knight sees dancing on the green.

And in his wey it happed hym to ryde,  
In al his care, under a forest syde,  
Wher as he saugh upon a daunce go  
Of ladyes foure and twenty and yet mo;  
Toward the whiche daunce he drow ful yerne,  
In hope that som wysdom sholde he lerne.  
But certeinly, er he cam fully there,  
Vanysshed was this daunce, he nyste where.  
No creature saugh he that bar lyf,

---

<sup>1</sup> Lucy Allen Paton, *Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, Boston, 1903, Chap. II.



Save on the grene he saugh sittynge a wyf . . .  
A fouler wight ther may no man devyse.<sup>2</sup>

The effect of the passage is to heighten the feeling of the supernatural and to prepare the mind for the power of the hag.<sup>3</sup>

Strikingly similar to this is a passage in the *De Nugis Curialium* of Walter Map:

Aliud non miraculum sed portentum nobis Walenses referunt. Wastinum Wastiniauc secus stagnum Brekeniauc, quod in circuitu duo miliaria tenet, mansisse aiunt et vidisse per tres claras a luna noctes choreas feminarum in campo auene sue et secutum eum eas fuisse donec in aqua stagni submergerentur, unam tamen quarta vice retinuisse.<sup>4</sup>

Both of these passages are used as transitions. The story of Wastin follows accounts of monks and miracles and kings and is the first of a series of marvels. It is found in a section of the work headed by the following prologue:

Victoria carnis est adversus (racionem), quod que Dei sunt minus appetit homo, que mundi maxime. Racio vero cum tenetur anime triumphus est, reddit que Cesaris Cesari, que Dei Deo. Duo premisi Dei misericordiam et iudicium continencia, que non solum non delectant, sed tediosa sunt, et expectantur sicut expectantur fabule poetarum, uel earum simie. Differantur tamen, si non auferantur, et que scimus aut credimus miracula premittamus.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> F. N. Robinson, *Complete Works of Chaucer*, Cambridge, 1933, Fragment III, vv. 989-999.

<sup>3</sup> H. R. Patch, "Chaucer and Mediaeval Romance," *Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell*, Cambridge, 1926, 108. Dorothy Everett, "The English Mediaeval Romances," *Essays and Studies of the English Association*, xv, Oxford, 1929, 109 and note, 110.

<sup>4</sup> *De Nugis Cur.*, ed. M. R. James, *Anc. Oxon.*, Mediaeval and Modern Series, Part XIV, Oxford, 1914, Dist. II, Cap. XI. A somewhat similar passage is to be found in the *Historia Danica* of Saxo Grammaticus, trans. Elton and Powell, Publ. Folklore Soc. XXXIII, London, 1894, III, 84: About this time, Hother chanced, while hunting, to be led astray by a mist, and he came on a certain lodge in which there were wood-maidens. And when they greeted him by his own name, he asked who they were. They declared it was their guidance and government that mainly determined the fortunes of war. For they often invisibly took part in battles, and by their secret assistance won for their friends the coveted victories. When Hother heard this, the place melted away and left him shelterless. . . . See also the story of Edric Wilde, told by Walter Map, *op. cit.*, Dist. II, Cap. XII. I am indebted to Professor Howard R. Patch for indicating these parallels to me.

<sup>5</sup> Map, *op. cit.*, Dist. II. See James Hinton, "Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*, Its Plan and Composition," *PMLA.*, xxxii, 1917, 81.

In the Wife of Bath's Tale, the description of the dancing ladies also appears as a transition—from the worldly, natural atmosphere of the prologue to the supernatural atmosphere of the knight and the loathly lady. It seems to me highly probable that Chaucer consciously inserted this description, recalling it from a knowledge of Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*.<sup>6</sup>

LILLA TRAIN

Northampton, Mass.

---

### ANOTHER "CANTEBURY TALE"

An interesting piece of woods lore, which seems to have escaped the Chaucer allusion hunters, appears in the writings of Col. William Byrd, in his account of the dividing line between Virginia and North Carolina. Byrd reports the tale from a certain Mr. Wilson who in 1728, at the time the line was marked between the two colonies, was living on the east side of the Dismal Swamp, but who "knew as little of it as he did of Terra Australis Incognita:"

He told us a Canterbury tale of a North Briton, whose curiosity spurred him a long way into this great desert . . . near twenty years ago, but he having no compass, nor seeing the sun for several days together, wandered about till he was almost famished; but at last he bethought himself of a secret his countrymen make use of to pilot themselves in a dark day. He took a fat louse out of his collar, and exposed it to the open day on a piece of white paper. . . . The poor insect, having no eye-lids, turned himself about till he found the darkest part of the heavens, and so made the best of his way towards the north. By this direction he steered himself safe out, and gave such a frightful account of the monsters he saw, and the distresses he underwent, that no mortal since has been hardy enough to go upon the like dangerous discovery.<sup>1</sup>

This printing of the tale, in 1841, almost a century after

<sup>6</sup> The evidence for Chaucer's knowledge of Map's work has been based hitherto on the use in the Wife of Bath's Prologue and the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women (Text G) of the *Epistola Valerii ad Rufinum de non ducenda uxore*, now generally admitted to be Map's.

For account of the fourteenth century manuscript see *De Nugis*, ed. James, Preface xi.

<sup>1</sup> *The Westover Manuscripts: Containing the History of the Dividing Line betwixt Virginia and North Carolina . . . Written from 1728 to 1736 . . . by William Byrd of Westover, Petersburg.* Printed by Edmund and Julian C. Ruffin, 1841, p. 20.

Byrd's death, purports to be the first. The Wynne edition of 1866,<sup>2</sup> "Printed from the Original Manuscript," is a second printing of the Chaucer allusion before 1900.

West Virginia University

LOUIS W. CHAPPELL

# SUGGESTED REPUNCTUATION OF A PASSAGE IN BEOWULF

May I suggest a repunctuation of the short passage (ll. 745b-749) that begins Beowulf's fight with Grendel? Klaeber has it (so also Grundtvig, Heyne-Schücking, Heyne-Socin, Sedgefield, Trautmann, Wyatt and Chambers, etc.):

Forð nēar ætstōp,  
nam þā mid handa higeþihtigne  
rinc on ræste, ræhte tōgēan[es]  
fēond mid folme; hē onfēng hraþe  
inwitþancum ond wið earm geset.<sup>1</sup>

Almost all variations of this (Arnold, Grein, Heyne, Kemble, Schaldemose, Thorpe, etc.) end the clause—and so change the subject from Grendel to Beowulf—after *ræste* rather than *folme*.

In either case there are obviable objections. In the first (as quoted) Grendel reaches toward his enemy after he has taken hold of him; besides, *fēond* is made to refer to Beowulf, when in every other instance of its singular use in the Grendel episode, it refers directly to Grendel [cf. also Wülker, *Engl. Stud.* 23. 306].

In the second common punctuation, this latter objection is removed; the first clause ends after *ræste* and the subject changes. But it does so too abruptly: the reference of the understood subject of *ræhte* to *rinc* is not clear and *hē* in the next line becomes superfluous.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas H. Wynne, *History of the Dividing Line and Other Tracts, from the Papers of William Byrd, of Westover, in Virginia, Esquire*, Richmond, Va., 1866, p. 39 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Klaeber's text and line-numbering are used here. A note to line 6, p. 36 of the Zupitza autotype (E. E. T. S. orig. ser. 77) reads: "after *ræste* an erasure of some five letters, of which the first seems to have been *h*, the second possibly was *a*." This does not affect the present question, the erasure being accepted as genuine by most editors.

This choice of punctuations has depended on whether *fēond* was considered nom. or acc.; nobody has thought to question the case of *rinc*. But let us start our new clause with it as nominative:

Forð nēar ætstōp,  
 nam þā mid handa    higeþihtigne;  
 rinc on ræste    ræhte tōgēan[es]  
 fēond mid folme:    hē onfēng hraþe  
 inwitþancum    ond wið earm gesæt.

This makes of *higeþihtigne* an adjective substantively used, but it also makes the change of subject perfectly clear, as it does the antecedent of *hē*, while still preserving the specialized meaning of *fēond*. The change of subject before *ræhte* gives us licence for going backward in time, since we are now talking of Beowulf; *folme* refers to his famous thirty-man-power grip, while *hraþe* and *ræhte*, both showing his eagerness, reinforce each other.

F. G. CASSIDY

*University of Michigan*

### BEOWULF, 489-490

*Sit nu to symle ond on sæl meoto  
 Sigehrep secgum, swa þin sefa hwette.*

In his first address to Hroþgar, Beowulf asks permission for himself and his band of Geats unhindered by Danes to stay in Heorot during the coming night; and, boasting a bit, he prophesies probable success for himself in his proposed fight there with Grendel. In the reply, of which these two lines are the end, Hroþgar admits that God might easily put an end to Grendel, presumably by means of such a god-sent agent as Beowulf, but confesses, nevertheless, that all his Danes have come to grief when they dared face the monster. He concludes, in effect, by saying: "Death removed all Danes who made the attempt to worst Grendel. But sit down and eat. [The hall is yours, as you have requested.] And in the hall [before the fight, however doubtful its outcome] reckon on victory for men [over Grendel, who can hardly be called a man] as you are inclined to do [though I know what happened to my Danes.]"

This version of this passage, and notably of *on sæl* ("in the hall") in it, seems worth insisting upon, though it is rarely, if

ever, given. Hroþgar naturally would reply immediately to Beowulf's request to be allowed to occupy the Danish thronehall with his Geats: the situation is unusual and the granting of the request significant, as ll. 653-661 make clear. The translation seems sound, since *meoto* has already been frequently regarded as a second person imperative and since similar *on*-phrases with the accusative are common — see "on" in Bosworth and Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, B, I, 2-3.

ARTHUR E. DuBOIS

Duquesne University

---

### THE CHRONOLOGY OF FRENCH LOAN-WORDS IN ENGLISH

Jespersen's table showing the chronology of French loan-words in English<sup>1</sup> is well known and often cited. Based upon 1000 French words, sorted into half centuries on the evidence of the earliest quotations in the *NED.*, it showed graphically that there was no perceptible penetration of French words into English until after 1150, that the great period of adoption was from 1250 to 1400, and that a sharp drop in the fifteenth century has been followed by a gradual tapering off ever since. His calculation was made when only about half of the *Oxford Dictionary* was available, and while this should be a sufficient basis for such a statistical study, I have recently had occasion to test his figures by a calculation based upon the completed dictionary and in one or two significant respects have arrived at different results. The new calculation therefore seems worth putting on record. In offering it I am not unmindful of the fact that Professor Jespersen was the first to perform the experiment and, however simple it seems now, he deserves the credit, like Columbus in the story of the egg, for having thought of it.

My calculation, like his, is based on 1000 French words. I began by taking all words on pages numbered -50 and -00 throughout the dictionary, but this yielded less than half the desired number of words. It was finally necessary to include also pages numbered -20, -40, -60, -80. After eliminating nonce words and a small

<sup>1</sup> *Growth and Structure*, 4th ed., p. 94.



number (designated as unassimilated in the *NED.*) which clearly had never been a part of the English language in any real sense, the total number of entries was 1031, of which I arbitrarily kept the first 1000. Purely English derivatives occurring on the same page with the base word were ignored. However, where the base word was on a preceding page I have counted the base word as the representative of the derivatives. Thus I allow *air* (1230) to represent *airily* (1797), *airiness* (1674), *airing* (1610), *airish* (1384), and *airless* (1601) since these derivatives were clearly not instances of words "borrowed" at the dates when they first occurred yet could not be ignored. They imply the existence of the word *air* and it seemed right to record the base word *air* (although on a previous page) and credit it to the half century in which it first appears. While Jespersen's method of taking the first hundred French words under A-G (and the first fifty under I and J) did not necessitate such a procedure, the fact that he also excluded derivatives of English formation makes his procedure really quite comparable.<sup>2</sup> For convenience of reference I give the figures of his table and mine in parallel columns:

	Jespersen	
.... 1050	2	2
1051-1100	2	0
1101-1150	1	2
1151-1200	15	7
1201-1250	64	35
1251-1300	127	99
1301-1350	120	108
1351-1400	180	198
1401-1450	70	74
1451-1500	76	90
1501-1550	84	62
1551-1600	91	95
1601-1650	69	61
1651-1700	34	37
1701-1750	24	33
1751-1800	16	26
1801-1850	23	46
1851-1900	2	25

<sup>2</sup> I have corrected the dates for about a score of words. The citations from the *Cursor Mundi* in the earlier volumes of the dictionary are variously

It will be observed at once that the most significant difference in these two columns is in the figures for the period 1150-1250, my table indicating a much slower rate of increase. The preeminence of the half century 1350-1400 is even more strikingly revealed. At the same time the figures of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially the nineteenth, are noticeably higher. This, I believe, is due to an important difference of method. Jespersen discarded all words not illustrated by at least five quotations. This works to the disadvantage of late borrowings, since the *NED.* seldom gives as many as five quotations from the same century, unless to illustrate various senses, and would have resulted in the elimination from my collection of such words as *alienist*, *bon-bon*, *carton*, *chaise-longue*, *char-a-banc*, *chiffon*, *coulomb*, *declass*, *demi-monde*, *gamin*, *millionaire*, *premiere*, and *remarque*.

I should like to point out what seems to me a necessary weakness in both tables. This is not so much the fact that a word may have been in common use somewhat earlier than the earliest *NED.* quotation. This seems to me, as it did to Jespersen, not to affect seriously the general picture presented by fifty year periods. I refer rather to the fact that the number of words found in a given period (at least up to 1400), seems to bear a very direct relation to the amount of literature preserved through the various centuries of Middle English. Unfortunately there is no remedy for whatever element of error results from this circumstance.

It may be noted in conclusion that of the 1031 words derived from the pages examined for the above calculation, 611 first occur

dated, but after a time the editors seem to have adopted the dating "*a(n)te* 1300" for all citations except those peculiar to the Göttingen MS. I have accordingly used this date (except for the Göttingen MS.) although a date 1300-1325 would perhaps have been better. Such a procedure has the advantage of allowing for the possibility that words first recorded in the *Cursor* were already in use at the close of the thirteenth century. I have also changed the date of quotations from the *Pearl* poet. These are dated 1300 in the *NED.*, which is certainly too early. I have followed the general opinion in assigning these to the half century 1350-1400. It would have been possible to re-date certain other quotations in the light of more recent scholarly opinion, but since it is difficult to know when to stop I have in these cases followed the *NED.* dating. In any case re-dating would not often have changed the half-century in which a word fell.

between 1150 and 1500. This would indicate a total adoption of French words in Middle English of slightly more than 10,000. Of these about seventy-five per cent have remained in general use.

ALBERT C. BAUGH

*University of Pennsylvania*

## HOODLUM

The origin of the English word HOODLUM is still unexplained. The *New English Dictionary* says: "The name originated in San Francisco about 1870-72, and began to excite attention elsewhere in the U. S. about 1877, by which time its origin was lost, and many fictitious stories, concocted to account for it, were current in newspapers."

The earliest citation in *NED*.<sup>1</sup> is from the *Sacramento Weekly Union* of February 24, 1872. "All the boys to be trained as . . . polite loafers, street-hounds, hoodlums, and bummers."<sup>2</sup> All these impolite appellations savor of the German. A dialect (Low German) form of *laufen* is suspected of being the ultimate origin of the U. S. slang term LOAFER.<sup>3</sup> BUMMER, likewise U. S. slang, and generally accepted to be of German origin, is a California product a few years older than HOODLUM.<sup>4</sup> STREET-HOUNDS is at least a German-like compound.<sup>5</sup> This environment should discredit the MULDOON > NOODLUM > HOODLUM fiction<sup>6</sup> and render suspect a "Spanish origin"<sup>7</sup> or a "pidgin English" theory.<sup>7</sup>

The second earliest citation: "Three hoodlums in San Francisco

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Farmer, John S., *Americanisms, Old and New*, London, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Thornton, Richard H., *An American Glossary*, London, 1912.

<sup>3</sup> *NED*. "G. landläufer (Landlouper)." *Century Dictionary*, "Germ. laufen; Du. loopen." Cf. also the German Strassenläufer, tramp. N. B. The first four recordings of LOAFER in Thornton emanate from the Dutch-German section of New York State, 1835-37. The earliest citation in *NED*. is in Thornton chronologically the fifth, and the first from outside of the Hudson Valley.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Thornton, I, 119.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e. g., Strassenjunge, Strassenbube, Strassenläufer and Lumpenhund, *infra*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Thornton, I, 444.

<sup>7</sup> Albert Barrère and Charles G. Leland, *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant*, London, 1897, p. 443.

were convicted on a charge of stealing beer",<sup>8</sup> suggests Germany and, even more, Bavaria. In both Sacramento, originally called New Helvetia by its south-German founder, Sutter, and San Francisco the Germans constituted the largest foreign-language group.<sup>9</sup>

The Germans, and especially the Bavarians, have a word which is, both phonetically and semantically, almost identical with HOODLUM. In colloquial Bavarian the word HODALUMP is quite common. In the recent little book *999 Worte Bayrisch* by Johann Lachner<sup>10</sup> it occurs often enough to make its meaning evident. When Lachner says that not even such language as "du brauchsts Mäu nēt ä sōh aufreiszn gēgn meinä, du Hodälump, du schlechtä" would cause a son to lay hands on his father, he implies that the word can have a very strong force.<sup>11</sup> He also states: "Je nach der Lage kritisierend, komisch, oder anerkennend sind die Bezeichnungen Tröhpf, Lump, Hodälump . . . Gaunä, Luädä, Spihzbuä," etc.<sup>12</sup>

Moreover both components, as well as the entire word, have long been known to literary German in the sense of HOODLUM.

Cf. Grimm's Wörterbuch:

HADER (2a) *fetzen, lumpen.*

(2c) *als schimpfwort für einen nichtswürdigen menschen, vgl. lump.*

HADERBUBE; HADERKATZE; HADERLUMP, —LUMPE, —LUMPEN, 2a) *in Tirol häderlump.*

HODDEL, HÜDDEL "*bei Luther in der bedeutung lumpen . . . bildlich, von einem menschen*"

HUDEL 1) *lumpen, lappen . . . später öfter und aus verschiedenen namentlich oberdeutschen landschaften bezeugt: panniculus.*

3) *schimpfwort für einen nichtswürdigen menschen (wie lump) noch jetzt schweizerisch viel gebraucht.*

HUDELBUBE

HUDELLAUFEN *vermummtes laufen zur fastnachtzeit: in Tirol.*

HUDELLUMP, —LUMPE *wie haderlump.*

HUDELMANN . . . *schwäb. hudelmanns waare, schlechtes gesindel.*

HUDELN *verb 1b) schweizerisch er hudelt nur führt nur eine schlechte lebensweise.*

HUDELPACK, HUDELSACK, HUDELVOLK, HUDER, HUDLER, HUDELGESINDE, *fax populi*

HUDLICHT, *lumpicht . . . auch im moralischen sinne, despectus, inglorious, frivolus.*

<sup>8</sup> Thornton, I, 444.

<sup>9</sup> *A Compendium of the Ninth Census* (June 1, 1870), Washington, 1872.

<sup>10</sup> München, no date, bei Müller.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

LUMP (rag) means today "nichtswürdiger Mensch" < 17th century "Mensch in zerlumpten Kleidern" < 16th century "zerfetztes stück zeug."<sup>13</sup> "Du Lump!" is a common, every-day expression for "You scamp!" See also Grimm:

LUMPENGESINDE, LUMPENHUND, LUMPENKERL, LUMPENMANN, 3) *armseliger, nichtswürdiger Mann.*

LUMPENPACK, LUMPENVOLK

LUMPENWAARE . . . *in Baiern lumpenwar auch von armseligen personen.*

It is evident that the HUDEL form is more common in the *oberdeutsch* territory. HUDELLUMP is a tautological formation, each part meant originally "rag(s)." Each component then acquired the meaning, a "raggedy," lowly, base person. The compound word has the meaning of each of these parts, i. e., raggamuffin, hoodlum.

We need only assume that in the process of borrowing the final "p" was lost and we have accounted for the form of our American word.

JOHN T. KRUMPELMANN

*St. Stephen's College, Columbia University*

# "WATER FASTAND"

Professor Strunk's note to line 352 of the *Secunda Pastorum* (MLN., March 1930, XLV, 151), explains the text more convincingly than does Dr. Adams (*Chief Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, p. 151, n. 1: "Fasting; thirsting for water?"), cautious as he is. Professor Strunk also points to the form in line 236, "lyys walteryng, by the roode, by the fyere, lo!" where the word is explained "lolling" (Adams, p. 149, n. 3) or "rolling or tossing about." (Cf. the modern *welter* and *waltz*.) That the form *water* might be a phonetic transcription of *walter*, Professor Strunk does not hint.

Many words which now have a voiced *l* were once pronounced without the *l* — such as *halter* (*King Lear*, I, iv, 343: cf. *N & Q*, clviii, 457) which rimes with *caught her*, *daughter*, *slaughter*, and *after*. Other formerly silent *l*'s are noted in *JEGP.*, January 1932,

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Grimm, and Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 10. Auflage, Berlin und Leipzig, 1924.

xxxI, 130-131: *realm, colts, the rime wote—fauhte—haulte* (*Ralph Roister Doister*, III, v, 38-40). The name *Ralph* (*Rafe*) is another example, and so is the Christian name *Walter*. In 2 *Henry VI*, iv, i, Suffolk is taken prisoner by a band of men which includes one Walter Whitmore. Upon hearing this name, Suffolk starts, and Whitmore asks

Why start'st thou? What, doth death

affright?

*Suf.* Thy name affrights me, in whose sound is death.

A cunning man did calculate my birth

And told me that by water I should die:

Yet let not this make thee be bloody-minded;

Thy name is Gualtier, being rightly sounded.

*Whit.* Gualtier, or Walter, which it is, I care not.

The death of Suffolk at Whitmore's hand ends the scene. He died by Walter.

It is not impossible that when the scribe, who wrote the MS. of the *Secunda Pastorum*, copied "My foytt sleyps, by Ihesus;/and I water fastand," he was spelling the word *walter* as it was pronounced. It is no unfamiliar phenomenon to find the same word spelled in more than one way, even in the same work, in Elizabethan times and earlier; the mania for standardization is of later growth.<sup>1</sup>

ROBERT WITHINGTON

Smith College

#### A SECOND MS. OF WYCLIF'S *DE DOMINIO CIVILI*

J. Sullivan, in the *English Historical Review*, 1905, p. 293 f., noticed that the MS., Bibliothèque Nationale 15869 of Marsiglio of Padua's *Defensor Pacis* was bound up with a paper MS., "a tract entitled *De Dominio Civili Hominis*." Upon comparing this MS. with the text of Wyclif's *De civili dominio* as printed by the Wyclif Society, 1884, and edited by R. L. Poole I found it to be another

<sup>1</sup> Frequently the presence of a silent *l* in words leads to its eventual pronunciation—cf. *golf*, which used to be (and still often is) pronounced "goff," at the same time that the *l* is creeping into the pronunciation. We all now say "fault," despite the Fr. *faute* (cf. L. *fallere*), though we do not pronounce the *b* in *doubt* which has crept in since Chaucer. The *c* in *perfect* is another letter which has established itself in the pronunciation.



MS. of Wyclif's work. Poole first edited the *De Civili Dominio* "from the unique manuscript at Vienna. . . . The three books *de civili Dominio* . . . are believed to exist only in a single copy, contained in two volumes and preserved in the imperial library at Vienna. . . . The . . . volume is written on vellum and bound in the original boards."

Dr. Poole studied the Vienna MS., and constructed his text from a transcript furnished by Dr. S. Herzberg-Fraenkel; he regretted that the text had to be made from the single manuscript. This Paris MS. has corrections, the word-order is not always the same as that of the Vienna text; some words in *Vienna* are not in *Paris*.

On fol. 103, top, after the *explicit* there follows "tractandum . . . 1381 16 Janii sedarum de Sorbona . . . magistrum," which localizes the MS., and gives an important date, also that of Berton's condemnation at Oxford.<sup>1</sup>

The paper of the MS., deserves notice, for the same kind is found in various libraries. It is heavy, with conspicuous watermarks, broad, horizontal and five vertical lines to a page. The watermark in the middle of the page varies: an animal (horse?), fol. 2; upside down, fol. 10; fleur-de-lys, upside down, fol. 15; crown with cross, fol. 19; flower, fol. 32; lamb and cross, fol. 62; hunting-horn, suspended, fol. 80; battle-axe, fol. 132. The sheets were carelessly put together, not in equal number. The paper is very like that of MS., Biblot. Nation. 14619 of the *Defensor Pacis*; and of MS., 1087 (Anc. fonds 342) in the municipal library of the Musée Calvert, Avignon: Ockam's *Tractatus de potestate* . . . assigned by the catalogue, Paris, 1894, i, p. 503, to the beginning of the Fifteenth Century.

The MS., Biblot. Nation., Paris, 14619 of the *Defensor Pacis* is bound up with *Articuli erronei Johs Wycleff heresiarche damnati Londiniis in Anglia a. do mccc. octagesimo*. The paper suggests MS., 15869, though not so coarse.

<sup>1</sup> If the Parisian faculty took Wyclif's book under advisement it should perhaps be reckoned with in the extraordinary demand they made upon the Clementine king in the following May for a general council. The *De Dominio Civili* is indeed highly doctrinaire, evangelical, impractical: it is not immediately connected with the Great Schism. Yet its discussion of Papal supremacy would be contributory to the determined arguments of the French professors in favor of a general council.

With MS. Biblot. Nation., 14620 of the *Defensor Pacis* is bound Gerson's *Tractus de potestate eccles. et de origine juris et legum*, drawn up for the Council of Constance, and dated Feb. vi, 1417 (fol. 137, verso); and the *Tractatus de jurisdictione eccles. potestatis* of Herv. Natalis.

In St. Mark's Library, Venice, MS., 2675, alternate vellum and paper, Wyclif's *Quaestiones* to fol. 58 are bound with John of Jandun's *Tractatus et quaestiones in Averrois*, ff. 61-96. The watermark is the same in both MSS., and the same as in

St. Mark's, Venice, 1553, a MS., of Petrarch's *Epist. fam. libri vi*. This MS. contains the *Litterae sine titulo* omitted by Fracasetti, but printed by Samuel Crispinus in his edition, Lyons, 1601. Crispin printed some sixty-five letters not in the Basle editions; but a collation of his text and this MS. showed many variations, in letter-headings, ascriptions, and *lacunae*—especially illustrated in Petrarch's letters to Colonna about the laureate.

Much has been written about watermarks, filigranes, wire-marks, the horizontal *vergueurs*, and the vertical 'spreaders,' or *pontuseaux*, and their significance and aid in dating a manuscript. Besides Giry's *Manuel de diplomatique*, Paris, 1894, and Prou's *Manuel de Paleographie*, Paris, 1924, the many studies by C.-M. Briquet, originally published in *Bibliographie moderne*, but reprinted separately and sold by H. Georg, Geneva, are useful to have on the ground.

Evidently, the notion of a community of doctrine between Marsiglio, John of Jandun and Wyclif was not limited to the bull and letters issued against Wyclif and sent to England from Sta. Maria Maggiore May 22, 1377 by Gregory XI. If Marsiglio's doctrines were among the *agenda* of the Council of Constance I find no mention of them in a secretary's record of the Council. Gerson and the French doctors would hardly bring up the name of the man who was the protagonist of the representative and conciliar idea. No one has yet shown textual indebtedness of Wyclif to Marsiglio; but the argument for some sort of secular control common to all three writers would be quite enough to link them together. From the manuscripts cited above this would seem to have been the case.

WM. PETERS REEVES

Kenyon College

---

BELPHEGOR IN GRIM THE COLLIER AND RICHE'S  
FAREWELL

The attractive comedy of *Grim the Collier of Croyden* is a clever interweaving of a number of strands, combining the tradition of Grim, "chief collier to the king's majesty's own mouth," with the legends of Saint Dunstan and of Robin Goodfellow, with Spenser's "Malbecco," and with the jest of the dumb wife cured, from the *Hundred Merry Tales*. These are minor elements. Printed in 1662, the play is presumably a revision of William Haughton's *The Devil and his Dame*, which Henslowe mentions in 1600, and finds its main plot in the story of Belphegor, the demon who married a wife to discover whether the damned were justified in unanimously blaming their wives for their consignment to hell. Machiavelli's *novella* has long been pointed out as the source, but the relation of the play to the *novella* needs a little clarification.

"The devil a married man" was evidently an oriental folk-tale originally. It is included in the *Çukasaptati*, the Turkish *Forty Vizirs*, and the *Thousand and One Nights*, and in recent times has been recorded from oral tradition in Egypt, Russia, Croatia, and Italy.<sup>1</sup> In literary form it first appeared in Europe in *Les Lamentations de Matheolus*, in the late thirteenth century.<sup>2</sup> In brief outline it occurs in the *Hecatomythium* of Lorenzo Abstemio (1505),<sup>3</sup> and later gives Hans Sachs material for a rhymed jest (1557).<sup>4</sup> As an Italian *novella* it was printed between 1545 and 1551 in several redactions which represented an original work by Machiavelli; and G. F. Straparola published an independent version of the tale, which was common property, in his *Tredici piacevoli notti*, 1550.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the bibliographical notes in Luigi Foscolo Benedetto, *Niccolò Machiavelli. Operette satiriche* (Torino, 1920), introd., esp. p. 4, n. 1. The Croatian tale has escaped such lists of the Belphegor story as I have seen. It is recorded by Dr. Fr. S. Krauss, *Sagen und Märchen der Südslaven* (Leipzig, 1884), II, 254.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. by A. G. van Hamel (Paris, 1892-1905), Book II, lines 3853-4034.

<sup>3</sup> In Book II, fable 95. Book I was published in 1495. Benedetto, *op. cit.*, p. 5, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Hans Sachs*, ed. Adelbert von Keller (1870-1908), IX, 284. "Schwank: Der teufel nam ein alts weib zu der eh."

<sup>5</sup> The fourth story for the second night.

In determining the source of *Grim the Collier* it will be useful to keep in mind several features of the play: the saint's vision of hell, the election of Belphegor and his mission to earth, his earthly name as Castiliano, and his proposed wife's name as Honorea. Comparison will then show the indebtedness of the play to Machiavelli, who includes the same incidents, the demon being Belphegor, his human name Roderigo di Castiglia, and his wife Honesta. In Straparola's similar tale there is no infernal council sending Belphegor on his mission; the demon is not identified with Belphegor but remains unnamed, as a demon; his earthly name is Pangrazio Stornello, and his wife is Silvia Ballastro.

The general similarity between the tales of Machiavelli and Straparola has led into a natural error almost every writer who has touched the subject of source, for we are told that *Grim the Collier* owes its plot to Barnabe Riche's translation of the Belphegor story in his *Farewell to Military Profession* (1581). Some scholars have asserted and others have implied that Riche translated Machiavelli,<sup>6</sup> but a comparison, with the characteristics mentioned before in mind, will show that Riche followed Straparola. The scene shifts to Scotland, but there is the same abrupt opening, omitting the vision of the council in hell; and the devil is named Balthaser, as man and demon, who weds mistress Mildred.<sup>7</sup> J. P. Collier noted the divergence from Machiavelli and so considered the tale the "most original part" of Riche's volume of translations.<sup>8</sup>

\* E. g., J. P. Collier *Eight Novels . . . by Barnaby Riche* (1846), being also Vol. I of *Early Prose and Poetical Tracts* (Shakespeare Soc., 1853), p. xvi; Emil Koepfel, "Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in der englischen Litteratur," *Quellen und Forschungen*, LXX (1892), 49, 99; E. Meyer, *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama* (Weimar, 1897), pp. 30 ff.; Mary A. Scott, "Elizabethan Translations from the Italian," Part I, *PMLA*, x, 273; William E. A. Axon, "The Story of Belfagor in Literature and Folk-Lore," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, 2nd Ser., XXIII (1902), 108. Prof. Felix E. Schelling's statement is correct but might be misleading: "Machiavelli's *novella* is, however, the direct source of the main plot." Footnote: "The story of Belphegor was first translated into English by B. Riche in his *Farewell to the Military Profession*, 1581." *Elizabethan Drama 1558-1642* (Boston, 1908), I, 356.

<sup>7</sup> The chief differences between the Straparola-Riche tale and Machiavelli's are found in the later and major portion of the story, only the beginning of which was used by the playwright.

\* Collier, *loc. cit.*

It should be plainly stated that Riche follows Straparola, and that the play follows Machiavelli in matters not contained in, or even suggested by, the Straparola-Riche version.

But to say that *Grim the Collier* is indebted to Machiavelli's *novella* is still indefinite, for the playwright might have used any of three different versions of the tale, printed by at least four different editors. According to Sig. Benedetto, the *novella* was probably an early work of Machiavelli, based partly on Matheolus. A manuscript copy in a hand identified as Machiavelli's exists, but it was never printed from directly until 1920. The story appeared in print first in Giovanni Brevio's *Rime et prose volgari*, 1545, eighteen years after Machiavelli's death, without ascription to Machiavelli. In 1549 Bernardo Giunti, in the first collected edition of Machiavelli's works, published a version differing in language from Brevio's, although otherwise similar. In 1551 A. F. Doni printed another version of the tale in his *Seconda libreria*, with the purpose, he said, of restoring the author's text and putting an end to such ridiculous mutilations as were appearing. He mentions Brevio, as he had done before in 1547, and hints at Giunti. The tale as he prints it differs at beginning and ending from Giunti's, which it otherwise resembles. Giunti's is closest to the existing manuscript.<sup>9</sup> Francesco Sansovino gave currency to Brevio's version by printing it in his *Cento novelle*, 1561.

Of the three versions, Doni's may be eliminated as the source of the play, for the altered beginning omits the vision of the saint, who becomes in the play the important character of Saint Dunstan.<sup>10</sup> Between the Giunti and Brevio versions there is little choice; the incidents of either could account for the play. But Brevio calls the wife Ermellina while Giunti names her Honesta, and the latter suggests the Honorea of the play. On this slight ground we may say that the play is a trifle closer to Giunti's version than to the others. We should therefore modify the usual statement, that *Grim the Collier* derives from Machiavelli through Riche his *Farewell to Militarie Profession*, and say that the play owes its main plot to Machiavelli's *novella* directly, no translation before 1600 being known; and probably to the version as printed by Giunti, or

<sup>9</sup> The various editions are described by Benedetto, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-18.

<sup>10</sup> Benedetto prints the Doni and Brevio versions in appendices.

as reprinted later in the John Wolfe ([London], 1588) or "Testina" editions of Machiavelli's works.<sup>11</sup>

D. W. THOMPSON

Cambridge, Massachusetts

---

## REVIEWS

---

*English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians.* Collected by CECIL J. SHARP. Edited by MAUD KARPELES. 2 vols. Pp. xxxvii + 436, xi + 411. [New York and] London: Oxford University Press, 1932. \$10.00.

*Ballads and Sea Songs of Newfoundland.* Collected and edited by ELIZABETH BRISTOL GREENLEAF. Music recorded in the field by GRACE YARROW MANSFIELD and the Editor. Pp. xli + 395. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933. \$5.00.

The two stout and handsome volumes of *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians* must not be confused with the single slimmer volume, now for some years out of print, that appeared under the same title in 1917 as the joint collection of Olive Dame Campbell and Cecil J. Sharp. Fortunately, all the material of the earlier edition, including Sharp's notable Introduction, reappears in the greatly enlarged recent publication. In place of the original 122 songs and ballads and 323 tunes, the new edition comprises 273 songs and ballads with 968 tunes—about three times the original amount. The new edition, like the old, is primarily a book of *songs*, without accompaniments, without elaborate annotation or critical discussion. Miss Karpeles has, however, supplied an admirably condensed Preface of nine pages, preluding Sharp's

<sup>11</sup> If I have read correctly Adolph Gerber, *Niccolò Machiavelli. Die Handschriften, Ausgaben, und Uebersetzungen seiner Werke* (Gotha, 1912), II, 83 ff., 90 ff., 92 ff., 98, there had been only two or three printings of the version probably used by the playwright before 1600. The Giunti text of 1549 was the basis of that printed by John Wolfe in London, in the volume of Machiavelli's works taking its title from *L'Asino d'oro*, 1588, with the false place-name Rome on the title-page; and the Wolfe text was the basis of the "Testina" edition, falsely dated 1550, but really printed between 1588 and 1619. The "Testina" edition may therefore have been later than the play. No translations before 1600 are recorded.



longer reprinted Introduction; she has added a few notes and a number of additional references, bringing the bibliography up to date; most important of all, she has been responsible for the selection and arrangement of the material from a much larger collection. All told, she has performed her large task effectively. Her share with Sharp in the original collecting of the material gives additional authority to her work as editor. The new *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians*, bearing the stamp of two such collector-editors and presenting as it does so generous a selection from the whole of Sharp's collections in America, takes its place at once in the forefront of the now numerous publications of American-English folk-song.

There would seem to be no just cause for any American scholar or local collector to feel aggrieved at this "intrusion" from without. Sharp was careful to respect the rights of established local collectors. His work in Virginia, for instance, was done with the cooperative approval of the Virginia Folk-lore Society, and he quite properly presented to the Society copies of all the ballad material he collected in the state. (It is to be regretted that not all later musician-collectors have in this honored the example of their master!) Sharp's collaboration with Mrs. Campbell is another instance of the same respect for established local collectors. In any case, the name of Cecil Sharp calls authoritative attention to the folk-song wealth of the Southern Appalachian region and adds that wealth immediately and definitively to the main stream of our English-speaking folk-song tradition.

Sharp's pioneer work, around the turn of the century and just after, as collector and interpreter of England's folk-songs, with emphasis on their musical character, is well known. Not until 1916 did he extend his collecting to America. Local collectors had just proved that the folk-singing tradition was more alive and vigorous in the Southern Appalachians than in England.

Sharp was evidently well pleased with what he found and delighted with the people he met, as, we may be sure, they were with him. His Introduction is a remarkable blend of the romantic travel sketch and a profound study of his subject. "Instead of having to confine my attention to the aged, as in England, where no one under the age of seventy ordinarily possesses the folk-song tradition," he says, "I discovered that I could get what I wanted from pretty nearly every one I met, young and old. In fact, I found myself for the first time in my life in a community in which singing was as common and almost as universal a practice as speaking." Melodies he found of characteristic charm and of absolute beauty. He lists a number, and Miss Karpeles adds to the list, of tunes that "will challenge the very finest of the folk-tunes that have been found in England." His system of modal classification,

explained in the Introduction, has been slightly revised in Miss Karpeles' Preface and has not been applied to all the later material.

This is not the place, nor this the reviewer, for a detailed musical analysis of the content of the volume. The 55 ballads of the earlier edition have become 72, the 55 songs have become 135, the dozen nursery songs have become 27, and three new classes are added, including 5 hymns, 15 jigs, and 20 play-party games. The 37 Child ballads of the earlier book have become 45, and in each case these are given the position of honor; but Sharp early recognized as fully as such later commentators as Professor Gerould that *ballad* has a broader meaning than some Child enthusiasts allow.

The make-up of the volumes recognizes the equal importance and the inseparability of text and tune. Thus these two musical scholars from the Old World, Sharp and Miss Karpeles, again come forward to redress the balance of a long too insistent emphasis, in this country, on the academic and textual study of folk-songs. It should be added that in general American folk-song scholars now recognize their past limitations and are doing their utmost to secure for the music of their songs adequate representation and competent treatment.

The ideal folk-song specialist would be a remarkable combination of varied abilities. He should be a competent scholar, a technically trained musician, an active collector in the field, and a man of good literary taste—to say nothing of those qualities of personality that will enable him to get along with all types of people. This ideal combination has never been achieved, unless it was in Cecil Sharp, who perhaps most nearly approached it. The essential antagonism, in this country at any rate, seems to be between music and scholarship. Our scholars have seldom been musicians, and still less have our musicians been scholars. Good conservatories we have had, which produce good performers, men of rich temperament and admirable technical knowledge. But there is little or no tradition in this country for the disciplined study of music at the university level, for the recognition of musical study, including even its technical side, as a legitimate interest of the well-rounded man and of the specialized scholar who has no intention of becoming a professional singer, pianist, or violinist. In a word, we have produced few musicologists. In this state of things, folk-song scholars, finding their technical musical equipment inadequate, must continue to co-opt the musical assistance they need. The day has passed when scholars could afford to ignore or subordinate the music of folk-songs; the day has not yet arrived when folk-song scholarship can with safety be turned over to the musicians.

*Ballads and Sea Songs from Newfoundland*, the latest addition to the Harvard University Press series of folk-song collections, is a good example of the successful co-opting of more expert musical assistance by a collector-editor primarily the literary enthusiast-

scholar, though with some musical competence. As the Vassar College Folk-lore Expedition to Newfoundland in 1929, Mrs. Greenleaf and Mrs. Mansfield completed the collecting begun in 1920 by Mrs. Greenleaf, when she was a summer volunteer teacher for Dr. Wilfred Grenfell's Mission. They have brought together a rich garner of varied material, and their editing, which is mainly Mrs. Greenleaf's, has done justice to the material.

The Newfoundland volume, as might be expected, most closely resembles Mackenzie's collection of *Ballads and Sea Songs from Nova Scotia*. The chief difference between the two concerns the music. The earlier volume printed 42 tunes for 162 ballads and songs. The more recent publication prints 99 tunes to 185 ballads and songs, and in addition 14 dance tunes (7 quadrilles, 3 cotillion figures, 2 jigs, and 2 step dances). What is more significant, the tunes, with the interwoven words of the first stanza, are printed in the body of the book along with the text, in the approved Sharp fashion, not relegated to an appendix as in the *Nova Scotia* and many other earlier volumes. It is clear that collectors and editors are doing their utmost to secure the music and to recognize its importance even in the method of printing.

The Newfoundland songs are very varied in character, running the gamut from 19 Child ballads, through many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century broadside ballads, to nineteenth- and even twentieth-century songs, many of them locally as well as recently composed. Apparently it does not take so long to make a folk-song as many people think, and folk-songs are still being made as well as imported. In Newfoundland the importations are chiefly from the British Isles, especially England and Ireland, secondarily from America and Canada. Though their borrowings continue, the Newfoundlanders themselves have composed not a few songs celebrating local happenings, and their manner of life gives a distinctive character to their choice of songs.

Upon the whole, however, one is impressed with the similarity of the songs known in the several singing localities on this side of the Atlantic. There are, of course, minor variations: Newfoundland naturally has more sea songs than the Southern Appalachians, a larger Irish element in place of the Southern Scotch, perhaps more interest (or is it simply more collectors' interest?) in songs commemorating local happenings, and there is a difference in the style of singing, variant melodies, variant words, as always in folk tradition. Yet the resemblances of the folk-song traditions of various localities are more striking. Songs have apparently seeped in and out of the several singing regions with surprising alacrity, and, though each region contributes a few distinctive rarities (such as "The Bonny Banks of the Virgie, O" and "The Unquiet Grave" from Newfoundland), much the same repertoire has found favor with singing folk in Newfoundland, in Nova Scotia, in

Maine, in the Southern Appalachians, and even in the Ozarks. This is natural, since, with some minor reservations, all these folk singers are carriers and continuators of the British tradition. The several singing regions are in effect far-separated portions of a single folk-song locality. In the essentials of folk culture it is not so far as the geographers say from Newfoundland to the Southern Appalachians.

ARTHUR KYLE DAVIS, JR.

*University of Virginia*

---

*Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations.* By GUDMUND SCHÜTTE. Vol. I, pp. xi + 288; vol. II, pp. xvi + 482. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929-1933; New York: The Macmillan Co., \$16.

The first volume of this encyclopedic work is a translation (made by Jean Young) of Dr. Schütte's *Vor Folkegruppe Gottjod* (Copenhagen, 1926). The second volume seems to have had no Danish original; in his Preface Dr. Schütte says only that "the English of the author's MS. has been revised by Miss Winifred Husbands." The work may be described as a highly systematic ethnological survey of classical and post-classical Germania. It goes with such works as Zeuss's *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, and is the only thing of its kind to be had in English. The author rejects the term *Germanic* in favor of *Gothonic*; hence the "Gothonic" of his title.

Apart from an introductory section of nine pages on the Indo-Europeans, vol. I is devoted to a general description of the Gothonic nations as a group. This great ethnic unit is considered under eight heads: name (pp. 10-37), subdivision (pp. 37-53), ethnic position (pp. 53-59), environment (60-137), old home (138-147), language (147-197), civilization (198-238) and history (238-253). Vol. II is devoted to the individual Gothonic tribes, which are taken up by sub-groups. Under each sub-group we are given, first, a description of the sub-group as a whole; next, a description of the sub-group by branches. The individual tribes which make up a given branch are considered in the course of the description of that branch. The eight heads used in vol. I are reduced to four (name, subdivision, ethnic position and history) in vol. II, but a ninth head (legendary traditions) is added. The author explains (p. xiii) that the missing heads were left untreated "owing to the lack of expert collaboration." He envisages his work as "a methodical framework, showing how the detailed information expected in an ethnic manual *should be arranged*." He adds, with a modesty blunting to the weapons of the critic, "the details themselves are

of very unequal quality." Each volume has a good index, and a bibliography is appended to vol. II. By way of illustration, 10 plates or figures appear at the end of the first volume; 20, at the end of the second.

Schütte's work will prove exceedingly valuable as an introduction to Germanic (or Gothonic) ethnology; in particular, his systematic presentation of the material will make it easier for the student to find his way about. One may legitimately object, however, to the author's boldness of interpretation in many a dubious matter. Such boldness is proper enough in a learned article or monograph, but out of place in a manual, meant to serve primarily as a guide for students and a work of reference. Since limitations of space forbade detailed discussion of moot points, theoretical constructions and far-fetched hypotheses ought to have been avoided, or, if touched upon, brought forward with due reservation. In the following I will point out a few cases of this kind, together with this and that in which I find myself at odds with my distinguished colleague.

Pp. 23 and 31: *philology* seems to be used in the sense 'definition of a word.' P. 33: Schütte's interpretation of the *epel Gotena of Widsith* 109 is hardly right; cf. *Widsith* 122. P. 54: one is astonished to read that "there seems to be general agreement on the fact that the Gothonic nations are a race of tall, fair long-skulls, whose mental characteristic is their organizing power and skill, as is apparent from the dynasties throughout Europe at the present day." P. 67: *Skotta* is surely not "a Gothic personal name." P. 77: the initial vowel in OE. *Estmere* is short; see my paper in *Speculum*, VIII, 67 ff. P. 81 footnote: why bring in the Swedes? P. 104: it is depressing to find Schütte not only clinging to such discredited equations as *Hliþe* = *Chlodio*, but actually bringing them forward without a hint that their validity had been called in question. P. 191: Jespersen has made doubtful the existence in OE. of a feminine suffix *-ster* (*MLR.*, XXII, 131 ff.). P. 241: Pytheas never "visited the Teutones near the Prussian amber coast." P. 251: the expedition of Hygelac took place some years later than A. D. 515; see R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf, An Introduction* (ed. of 1921, pp. 381 f.; ed. of 1932, pp. 383 ff.). Vol. II, pp. 12 and 27: we have no evidence that King Alfred's *Witland* is an OHG. form. P. 31: Heoden, the foe of Hægena, could hardly have been an object of worship among the Rugians! P. 34: Heorrenda was a scop, not a leader of the Heodeningas. P. 69: the ancestors of the English nation were not "Germanized" at all, whether in the ninth century or at any other time. P. 108: the North Swabians play no part in the OE. legends of the Migration Age; the *Swæfe* of *Widsith* are the Eider-Suebi (see Hoops *Reallex s. v.*). P. 127: the Witta of *Widsith* 22 is in no way "connected with the persons of the Hjaðning Legend." Pp. 180, 214, 250: the



Quadi of Zosimus were presumably Suebi, not Chauci; since Zosimus makes them a branch of the Saxons, we may well connect them with the Eider-Suebi. P. 244: the Normans who followed Duke William in 1066 were Frenchmen, not Scandinavians. P. 314: *Angelþeow* is not *Angelþeod*, in spite of Schütte's *i.e.*; Eomær is not named in *Beowulf*, though emendators have inserted his name in the text; Offa does not marry the widow of Hygelac! The chronological problem in *Widsith* is not properly put in the statement that "*Widsith* unhesitatingly makes Ostrogotha who lived about 250 shake hands with Albuin who lived about 550." This statement gives us likewise a good illustration of the troubles which beset a foreigner when he tries to write in English. P. 324: Hunlaf is not mentioned in *Beowulf*, though a sword-name *Hunlafing* occurs; Ordlaſ and Guþlaſ are named in *Finnsburg* 16; there is no statement in *Finnsburg* that Sigeferþ is ruler of the Secgan; on the contrary, he is represented as a *wreccea* 'adventurer' who has taken service with Hnæf; the Sæferð of *Widsith* 31 is therefore not to be identified with the Sigeferþ, *Secgena leod* 'man of the Secgan' referred to in *Finnsburg*, though the two may well have been kinsmen. I cannot agree with Schütte that Pliny's *Gutones* is a corrupt form; see my paper in *Namn och Bygd*, xxii, 34 ff. P. 363: Hengest and Horsa were presumably Eider-Suebi, not Jutes, if the genealogies can be trusted. P. 372: *Widsith* 22 is to be connected not with the preceding but with the following line; lines 22 f. make up a couplet. Pp. 375 f.: the sketch of early Danish history here given is not in agreement with our oldest monuments, viz., *Widsith*, *Beowulf* and the *Bjarkamál*; Schütte seems to prefer the latest and least trustworthy monuments in making his reconstruction of the course of events. P. 412: there is no sound basis for the identification of Eanmund and Eadgils with the Homothus and Hogrimus of Saxo.

KEMP MALONE

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen. Mit einem Anhang: Zur Charakterisierungstechnik im Beowulfepos.* Von LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING. Abhandlungen der philol.-hist. Kl. der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Band XLII, Nr. V. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1933. Pp. iv + 46.

In this profound study of Old Germanic—especially Old English—heroic philosophy Professor Schücking selects a few traits of heroic behaviour, traits striking, even offensive to the modern mind, words insufficiently understood, and shows how they all are part and parcel of the heroic attitude towards life. The gist



of the heroic philosophy is glorification of one's self, a superb individualism which employs every possible means to the perfection of one's life. Many things enter into the ideal of a heathen hero: noble birth, strength of body and mind, faith in the follower, liberality in the leader, especially the king, wisdom and unswerving courage under all circumstances, but the most priceless possession of the hero is fame, OE *dōm*, the admiring judgment of men near and far, in space and time alike. Nowhere has this been more pointedly expressed than in the famous stanzas (77.78) of *Hávamál*:

*Deyr fé, deyja frændr,  
deyr sjalfr it sama;  
enn orðstírr deyr aldregi  
hveim er sér góðan getr.*

and:

*Deyr fé, deyja frændr  
deyr sjalfr it sama;  
ek veit einn at aldri deyr:  
dómr um dauðan hvern.*

It seems strange that Prof. Schücking should not mention this well-known parallel to the OE *dóm*, which he discusses on p. 14. One might, indeed, think that he had been avoiding the obvious, if it did not appear in other places that he left out Old Icel. parallels even to the detriment of his argumentation. Thus, in trying to establish a new meaning for the OE *gylp*, he quotes parallels from Homer and from the Old Indian heroic poetry, not to speak of the German *Hildebrandslied* and *Walthari-lied* but he leaves the "flytings" of the *Edda* entirely out of the picture, although they are almost perfect illustrations of the meaning he wants to see in *gylp*.<sup>1</sup>

That such ignoring of the Old Icelandic material is unfortunate is best shown by Schücking's discussion of the word *beot*. For it is not only true, as he says, that until now the difference in meaning between *beot* and *gylp* has been insufficiently understood; it is also safe to say that the word *beot*, in spite of its known etymology (< *bihāt*), has generally been poorly understood. "Boast" and "boasting" have been the traditional English translation of the word. However, anybody acquainted with the well-attested custom of *heitstrenging* in Icelandic literature could not fail to see in the *beot* passages of *Beowulf* and the *Battle of Maldon* essentially the same custom.<sup>2</sup> This was already recognized by Nyrop, "En middel-

<sup>1</sup> *Helga kviða Hundingsbana*, II, 22 and *Helga kv. Hund.*, I, 33-44: a flyting between Guðmundr Granmarsson and Sinfjötli before the battle. They vie in vilification of each other, until Helgi stays Sinfjötli with the remark that it were more seemly for them to fight than to spend their strength in wasting vain words. Cf. Schücking, p. 9, note 2.

<sup>2</sup> Probably the best-known example of *heitstrenging* is the vows made by the famous *Jómsvíkingar* at the funeral feast given by Sveinn tjúguskegg

alderlig Skik" (*Nordisk Tidskrift*, utg. af Letterstedtska föreningen. XII, 1889)—forty-four years before Schücking's study—and Schücking might well have called attention to the fact when he quoted Nyrop.

According to Schücking (p. 8) *beot* is used before the comrades, *gylp* before the adversary; common to both is the reference to one's own glorious deeds. *Gylp*—etymologically connected with *yell*—is the loud denunciation of the enemy, combined with boasting of your own deeds, a procedure designed to fill yourself with courage for the coming fight. This ingenious interpretation of *gylp* is based on one passage in *Beowulf* only (v. 2528). In an article, which has recently appeared in *PMLA*. (Dec., 1934, pp. 975-993), I did not venture further than to assert that *bēot* stressed the promise and *gylp* the boast, but this difference was not very clear in the sources. Actually the words mean the same in most cases. But even if Schücking were not right in his interpretation of the *Beowulf* passage, I am inclined to agree with him that this was the original meaning of the word in view of its etymology and the well-documented custom of flyting in the *Edda* and elsewhere.

Schücking's confrontation of the heathen ideal of life with the Christian one is both felicitous and instructive. His method is to show how some words, like *gylp*, *wlencu*, which are *epitheta ornantia* in paganism, sink down to the level of derogatory words in the Christian ideology. Pride and self-respect had to be bent under the Christian yoke of humility. Nothing shows better than the constant hammering of the clergy on this very virtue of humility how stubborn were the necks of the heathen, and how innate in them was the ideal of proud dignity. Another term, not mentioned by Schücking, serves to illustrate this. It is the word *wine* as applied to the king and his retainer, e. g., *Beowulf* 30, 1418, or in the compound *winedryhten*. It means that—originally at any rate—the bond between king and retainer was one of friendship first and foremost (cf. the relationship between the Icelandic *goði* and his *þingmenn*). That the attitude of the heathen to his god was somewhat similar may, perhaps, be inferred from the numerous instances in the Icelandic sagas where a person is said to be a great friend of his special god (*þórr*, *Freyr* etc.), or *vice versa*. Well known is the story of Hrafnkell Freysgoði and his horse, Faxi: *Hann gaf Frey, vin sínum, þann hest hálfan* "he gave to his friend Frey that horse half." Frey is his friend, not his lord, and of humility on Hrafnkell's part there is no trace: as soon as he thinks that Frey has deserted him, he breaks with him for good.

in honor of his father Haraldr Gormsson (cf. *Heimskringla*, transl. by Morris and Magnússon, I, 271-273). The whole episode of the *Jómavikingar* of late has come in for severe criticism by historians (Weibull), but none has noticed that the seemingly romantic tale of the feast and its wild vows receives the best support from the contemporary and fully authentic *Battle of Maldon*.

In an *Anhang* Schücking discusses the technic of characterization employed in *Beowulf*. Here he shows that many of the things which seem awkward and inopportune to the modern reader are by no means slips of the poet, but are actually intended by him to convey certain impressions. Here, too, he traces the individual facts back to their source in the poet's philosophy of life. Interesting is his remark (p. 31) that in OE society (*Beowulf*) youth did not enjoy the same esteem as maturity, and this, he thinks, is a Christian trait, for it seems to be foreign to the Scandinavian world. There is perhaps something in this, cf. the OE rank of *ealdorman*, known in O. Danish, but not in Norwegian-Icelandic (A. Bugge, *Studier over de norske byers selvstyre og handel*, p. 84 (Kria, 1899).). Icelandic sagas also contain numerous instances of precociousness, but on the other hand there are such examples as Njáll with his many sons, who, unruly as they are, always submit to his bidding, and who, though grown up and married, continue to live at their father's house. It seems to be a real instance of patriarchy.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Geoffrey Chaucer and the Development of his Genius.* By JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934. Pp. x + 246. \$2.50.

Mr. Lowes' study of Chaucer was not prepared for specialists. It has a definitely popular appeal and, like G. K. Chesterton's illuminating criticism of the poet, will have a far-reaching influence in bringing Chaucer somewhat nearer his due in both England and America. The book consists of five lectures, "printed essentially as they were delivered" (p. vii) at Swarthmore College in 1932. The requirement that these lectures be published as lectures precluded references and notes, and there is no index. It is slightly unorthodox to examine from the scholarly point of view lectures which are unpretentious in scholarship. Lowes, however, is one of the few men whose lectures admit and even welcome such treatment. Those on *Convention and Revolt in Poetry* are of the stuff which makes the bed-rock of modern criticism; those which form the heart of *The Road to Xanadu* represent a landmark in literary scholarship; and Chaucerians will look to Lowes' latest book as a portion of their heritage. They may regret that the lectures had to be published simply as lectures, and that the years of great research, the powerful understanding, and the zest for life embodied in this book could not have made a study comparable to that on Coleridge's genius—to which Lowes indeed was led while

intent upon Chaucer himself. Such regret is not mitigated by the inclusive nature of the title, which suggests that here are Lowes' final dicta upon the poet.

Since the lectures are not primarily for students of Chaucer, they naturally involve much that is not new. Mr. Lowes himself expresses distaste for his summaries of such poems as *Troilus and Criseyde*; many of the comments on the minor poetry are time-worn, even though imperishable. At times readers must have an intimate acquaintance with Chaucerian research to distinguish fact from opinion. A case in point is the statement (pp. 55-56) that when in 1373 Chaucer returned from Florence to England "he carried with him manuscripts of Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch." From this first Italian journey, surely, dates Chaucer's knowledge of Dante's work, but not necessarily of the writings of the other two. Unless the *Parliament of Fowls* came before the second journey (1378)—and the classical later dating has not been thoroughly shaken—Chaucer may not have read even the *Teseide* before that time; and a knowledge of Boccaccio's other works and of Petrarch's does not appear before Chaucer's mission to Milan. There, in 1378, he visited the court of generous patrons of learning with whom Petrarch had resided eight years and where Bernabò Visconti had an extensive library. I plan later to elaborate on Chaucer's possible literary gains from this "God of delit," but for the present I wish only to suggest that perhaps Chaucer did not obtain manuscripts of Boccaccio and Petrarch in 1373. Mr. Lowes' assertion need never affect general readers; but like an error in detail on page 95, where the first "1388"<sup>1</sup> should read "1368," it discourages students from looking here for factual knowledge.

Of course it is not for such matters that they will read this book, nor to be told (p. 195) the framework of the *Decameron* is static, nor for the attempts to enliven Chaucer's reputation by means of humor at the expense of Machaut and Gower. They will rather note that in retelling established comments regarding Chaucer's life, times, and work, Lowes has for the most part taken the point of view of the fourteenth century and with his wealth of erudition and wisely human tone has restored much of the atmosphere of the poet's day. Chaucer is presented as a man of affairs and a reader of books, and the influences which promoted the growth of his poetical power are vividly elucidated. Familiar lines obtain rich meaning, and characters come to life. One sees the pathetically ironic situation of Pandarus, and the womanliness of Criseyde. As the pilgrims take the Canterbury road, Harry Bailey becomes their *Chorus*; the company and their tales alike glow with vitality and color. Chaucer is Mr. Lowes' "oune bok"; and in his arduous

<sup>1</sup> That this "1388" is not a typographical error is shown by its second mention as "this same 1388," in reference to an occurrence in that year.

scholarship Lowes has never forgotten that research is not merely anatomical, but can be justified only when in the end it restores the breath of life.

ROBERT ARMSTRONG PRATT

*The University of Rochester*

---

*The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Mediaeval English Literature.*

By WILLIAM O. WEHRLE. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1933. Pp. xxxvii + 186.

The Macaronic element in English poetry has so far failed to receive a thorough and comprehensive treatment. Dr. Wehrle has taken the Macaronic lyric of the Old and Middle English periods for the subject of his dissertation for the Ph. D. in English at the Catholic University of America. "I have," he states in his preface, . . . "narrowed down the topic of macaronic poetry to these religious lyrical effusions, not neglecting, however, the few political, ironic, and convivial poems that conform to the general macaronic traditions of the hymns investigated. I shall attempt likewise to show that the Latin interlacings in these poems are for the most part borrowings from the hymns or liturgical prayers of the Church." Since this statement represents what Dr. Wehrle has actually set out to do in his study, I wish that he had been more fortunate in the choice of his title. It is not sufficiently inclusive.

After a rather diffuse introduction follow brief chapters on 'The Old English Period,' 'The Thirteenth Century,' and 'The Fourteenth Century.' Then follow two longer chapters on 'The Fifteenth Century' and 'Lydgate and Ryman.' Dr. Wehrle divides the poems into thirteen types according to the placing of the 'macaronic' elements. Though the work of mechanical classification is done carefully, Dr. Wehrle would have produced a better study if he had made more use of condensation and had gone more thoroughly into the subject. I fear he is sweeping too large a field—a field large enough for at least two dissertations, I should say.

Turning to details, I wish to call attention to some questionable statements and to some important bibliographical omissions. Did Lactantius write the Latin *Phoenix* (p. 2) and did Cynewulf write the Anglo-Saxon *Phoenix* (p. 6)? In his treatment of the 'Anglo-Norman Drinking Song' (pp. 19-27), Dr. Wehrle would have profited by the use of Eero Ilvonen, *Parodies de Thèmes pieux dans la poésie française du Moyen Age* (Helsingfors, 1914) and the critical edition of the poem by Gaston Paris (*Romania*, XXI, 262); Paul Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter* (München, 1922); Joseph Bédier, *Les Fabliaux*; and Francesco Novati 'La parodia sacra nelle letterature moderne' (*Studi Critici e Letterari*, Torino,

1889). Carleton Brown's excellent edition of *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford, 1932) appeared too late for use in this study, I suppose. Statements made by Dr. Wehrle on pages 32 and 33 would be modified after an examination of Poem 17 in Brown. The poem in Harley MS. 2253 (Wehrle, p. 43) is assigned by Brown to the thirteenth century (See Brown, Poem 87).

The hymn from which the line *Consurgat Christus tumulo* is taken Dr. Wehrle says he was unable to find (pp. 131-132). The next to the last stanza of Hymn CIX in A. S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns* (Cambridge University Press, 1922) begins with this line. This hymn beginning *Ad cenam agni providi* was formerly "assigned to Vespers at Easter, but in the modern Roman breviary in its rewritten form *Ad regias agni dapes* it is appointed for the First Sunday after Easter (*dominica in albis*)" (Walpole, *op. cit.*, p. 349).

MILLETT HENSHAW

St. Louis University

---

*The English Folk-Play.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 248. \$3.75.

This volume deals especially with the Mummers' Play and its congeners: the Plough Play, the Sword Dance, and the Morris Dance. The important studies of Tiddy and Baskerville and many additional texts of the folk-plays have become available since Chambers wrote *The Mediaeval Stage*, and accordingly he now reviews the whole subject with the help of this new material. His conclusions, in brief, are that the Mummers' Play and its associates represent the survivals of a primitive European *ludus* of a ceremonial type performed in the spring to bring good luck to fields and flocks; that into this ritualistic, agricultural *ludus*—the central features of which were a mock death and revival—there crept various fragments of folk custom; that upon the play there was grafted, not earlier than the end of the sixteenth century and perhaps later, a text which became traditional and which was in large measure derived from Richard Johnson's *Famous Historie of the Seaven Champions of Christendom*; and that, finally, this text in its various surviving versions is liberally farced with literary accretions dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

For the author's presentation of widely scattered versions of the plays, for his keen analyses of their conflations and interrelations, and for his documentation of such early references to the plays as exist, all students of the drama will be grateful. Moreover, those interested in the problems of oral transmission may here observe many a posited phenomenon in actual operation. For example, in



one community or another, the mummers are known as mummies, the Pasch Egg is a Pace Egg, and the line, "Activity of youth, activity of age" becomes "Act Timothy of youth, act Timothy of age." The latest recruit to the traditional group of characters—which includes, it will be remembered, Saint George and the Turkish Knight—is introduced with the words, "In steps I, a suffragette."

It is the author's conjectures for the period antecedent to the sixteenth century—a period for which he must necessarily depend upon subjective reasoning—that will arouse most controversy. His evidence (pp. 165 ff.) for connecting the Doctor of the Mummers' Play with the Spice-Merchant of the religious drama seems to me tenuous. (Incidentally, the Spice-Merchant appears in the liturgical plays at least a century earlier than C. assumes; cf. K. Young, *The Drama of the Mediaeval Church*, I, 678.) Other debatable points are the suggested analogue of the "beheading game" in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (p. 161), the potential parallels in the moralities (pp. 163 ff.), the statement that "the name 'Fool' derives from the Latin *folis*, a wind-bag, through the puffed cheeks of *mimi*" (p. 225) and the assumption of an independent Wooing Play of late origin (p. 235).

Criticism of the author's investigations into the remoter origins of the Mummers' Play—its possible connections with modern Balkan festivals, primitive ritual and Frazer's *Golden Bough*—must be left to professional folklorists. Those who have found Chambers' past judgments so frequently vindicated by the discovery of new evidence will doubtless feel that in the woods of unverifiable hypotheses he is as safe and sensible a guide as any man. At all events there is no question but that his book is the best in its field.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*Brittons Bowre of Delights*, 1591. Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xxvi + 116. \$4.00.

This book, a collotype facsimile of the unique copy in the Huntington Library, is not printed merely as a literary curiosity; to help us restore *The Bower* to its rightful place among Elizabethan miscellanies, Professor Rollins has supplied a brief but inclusive introduction, interesting annotations, and variant readings. *The Bower* was published without Nicholas Breton's consent. Protesting with some heat against the liberty taken by the printer, Richard Jones, and acknowledging only "Amoris Lachrimae" and a few other "toies," Breton was no doubt too inclusive

in his disclaimer of authorship, for many of the poems appear to be his work. They are uneven in merit, and abound in the conventions of Elizabethan "conceited" verse,—paradoxes, acrostics, stiff similes. A fair estimate of the book could be made by comparing the poem "Of his Mistresse loue" (p. 21), reasonably typical of *The Bower*, with Lyly's song "Cupid and my Campaspe." "Amoris Lachrimae," the first and longest poem in the volume, is an elegy on Sir Philip Sidney, who is celebrated further in several short pieces. Complimentary acrostics, love poems, songs about Cupid, and "complaints" account for most of the contents.

In his introduction, Professor Rollins gives some account of the history of the unique copy of the first edition; describes the second edition (1597), of which only two copies survive; presents the evidence concerning Breton's relations with printer Jones; notes the changes in content in the second edition of *The Bower* and the related parts of *The Arbor of Amorous Devices*; discusses Jones's editorial practices; touches upon the question of Breton's authorship; and lists interesting points in vocabulary and metrics. The chief merit of the notes is the skillful tracing of the history of the poems in other anthologies, both manuscript and printed. In this field Professor Rollins is very much at home, and he gives a lucid and interesting account of the variant forms of the poems.

Generally satisfactory as they are, the introduction and notes are not free from error. We are told (p. xxv) that "Sir Egerton Brydges, editing Phillips's *Theatrum* in 1800, as well as *Excerpta Tudoriana* in 1814, apparently did not even know *The Bower* by title." But Brydges, planning to reedit the *Theatrum*, printed in both editions of *Censura Literaria* (2nd ed., III, 406) some supplementary notes sent him by a correspondent, including one on the 1591 *Bower*. He makes another reference to the book in his edition of *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, 1810, p. xiii (*British Bibliographer*, III). A few notes are superficial; the reader who would not be bothered by obvious misprints (p. 63) would hardly need to have "thou winnest the golden ball" explained: "That is, for beauty, as Venus won the golden apple by the judgment of Paris" (47.32 on p. 99).

Professor Rollins is content with a general and not altogether consistent account of the biographical and literary relationships of the Sidney poems. In his preface to the first edition of *Astrophel and Stella*, 1591, Nashe makes a scornful allusion to *The Bower*, which Professor Rollins cites (p. xxiv) as the first contemporary reference to this collection. If Nashe's remark about "Pan sitting in his bower of delights" refers to Breton's work, then obviously *Astrophel and Stella* follows *The Bower* in order of publication, and should not be included in the note on "Whose workes are extant to the worlde" (25.23 on p. 84). The point is not a mere quibble, but bears directly on Breton's knowledge of

the poems and their probable meaning. Would he have known them at all prior to their publication? Professor Rollins could have argued plausibly for an acquaintance with the sonnet sequence from Breton's relations with the Countess of Pembroke, but overlooking the question of order of publication, he takes that knowledge for granted. Consequently he annotates the line "In all the skie he honoured but a starre" as a reference to Penelope Rich (7.26 on p. 71), and makes no comment on the highly conventional "Phillis" (13.28) who laments her shepherd's end. Nashe's allusion, Breton's association with Sidney's sister, Breton's poems on Sidney, and his acrostic on Penelope Rich (p. 19), not preserved elsewhere, need a more precise integration with our knowledge of Sidney than they receive here.

The textual work is sometimes disappointing in its limitations. The listing of variant readings runs too strongly to typographical errors, like the frequent confusion of *r* and *t*, for literary purposes; and the selective treatment of the orthographical changes and the exclusion of punctuation variants make the notes inadequate for bibliographical purposes. Apparently some changes which may very well affect the meaning are excluded as mere variations in spelling. To give but one example, in "Amoris Lachrymae" a line which reads "And for my selfe to see thee wo begone thee" (10.24) becomes in the 1597 edition "And for my selfe to see the wo begune thee," a change which is not noted at all. Again, the complete exclusion of punctuation variants obscures the fact that the 1597 *Bower* occasionally makes an improvement, as on p. 13, l. 18, where a comma is correctly substituted for a period at the end of the line. A less, rather than more, elaborate textual apparatus (but one less mechanically limited in scope) would be appropriate for this particular text. The examples I have given are fairly representative of the results of arbitrary exclusion.

I have noted very few misprints: p. xiv, read *Cūtrey* for *Cutrey*; p. 64 (11.17) read *griefe* for *griefel*; p. 83 (25.16) read *and*<sup>2</sup> for *and*. It is more of a compliment than an injustice to Professor Rollins that I have stated the virtues of his edition in sentences, and the faults, in some instances bordering on differences of opinion, in paragraphs. The variety of the materials in this little miscellany required and received a corresponding variety in treatment, and the student generally will find the critical treatment adequate either as a self-contained explanation or as a starting point for more detailed study.

ERNEST A. STRATHMANN

Pomona College

*The Songs of Thomas D'Urfey.* Edited by CYRUS LAURENCE DAY.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. x + 168.  
\$2.50.

A book on D'Urfey has been so long overdue that Professor Day's work is assured of a welcome. His Introduction includes an admirable life of the poet, containing much new matter, for which all students of the period will be grateful; a considered appraisal of his long-forgotten works, which included plays, operas, satires, fables and tales; and a discussion of his once-famous songs, by which alone his diminished name survives.

The importance of D'Urfey in his day and generation cannot be questioned. He was pre-eminent as a song-writer for some forty years; his lyrics (there were in all nearly five hundred of them) were everywhere sung, by king and courtier, citizen and apprentice, squire and yokel; and sixty years after his death many of them still held their place in public affection.

The editor has chosen and reprinted twenty-six of "the most meritorious, the most popular, and the most typical" of D'Urfey's songs; and few will be able to quarrel with his choice. One student here and there may wish some substitution of pieces—would in so restricted a collection gladly have spared, for instance, the long anecdotal ballad (twenty-one stanzas *plus* chorus) for two or three such charming things as: "Sweet, use your time," "Was it some Cherubin," or, "I Follow'd Fame," which find no place here; but that kind of criticism is almost inevitable with a book of selections.

The words of the songs are accompanied by facsimiles of their original musical settings, the work of various contemporary composers—Purcell, Blow, and others—among whom D'Urfey himself figures. The poet was proud of his musical capacity; indeed, in the Dedication of *Songs Compleat*, Vol. I, 1719, he roundly asserted that his peculiar fitness for the compilation of that famous collection lay in his "double Genius for Poetry and Musick." It is therefore a little surprising that so few of his tunes should have been discovered. Professor Day has been able to unearth two only (one of which he prints), and says: "There is no authority for the attribution of any other extant tunes to D'Urfey." In the British Museum, however, there is a third which has escaped his scrutiny: a single sheet containing the words and music of "One Sunday at St. James's prayers," the heading of which quite definitely states: "A New Song Sett by Mr. Tho. Durfey" (H. 1601, 338).

Professor Day also furnishes in the Notes "a bibliographical account" of each song included by him. These lists of reprints of the songs reveal, as nothing else could do, their long-continued popularity. Nevertheless, the songs were in much greater demand than is shown even in these bibliographies. A single example will suffice:

the song, "We all to conqu'ring Beauty bow," is cited as having been reprinted thirteen times between D'Urfey's death and 1790. That number can be almost trebled. In addition to the books or editions listed, the song also appeared in *The Hive*, 1724, and *ibid.*, Vol. I, 1726; *The Choice*, 1729, and *ibid.*, Vol. I, 1732; *The Lark*, 1740, and 1742; *The Merry Companion*, 1742; *The Aviary* [1744], and [1763?]; *The Robin*, 1749; *The Charmer*, Vol. I, 1751; *The Sports of the Muses*, Vol. I, 1752; *The Muses Delight*, 1754; *The Polite Songster*, 1758; *The Vocal Magazine*, 1781; and in at least eight (and almost certainly more) editions of *The Tea-Table Miscellany*, printed in London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and elsewhere, between 1733 and 1788; and even so, it would be rash to imagine the list complete. The "accounts" of many of the other songs could in like manner be extended; but the main result, beyond exhaustion of the bibliographer, would be only to emphasize the unquestioned popularity of D'Urfey, and thus still further justify Professor Day in his choice of subject which he has here so adequately treated.

NORMAN AULT

Oxford

---

*The Nineteenth Century and After.* By H. V. ROUTH, Chapter XII of *The Year's Work in English Studies*, Volume XII, 1931. Edited by FREDERICK S. BOAZ and MARY S. SERJEANTSON. London: Oxford Press, 1933. Pp. 342. \$3.00.

In "The Romantic Revival" Mr. Routh discusses 3 articles and 22 books; in "The Victorian Era," 22 books; in the rest of the chapter, 8 articles and 35 books of which 8 are from German presses, 6 from the University of Pennsylvania Press, 7 from the Oxford Press, and 8 were published in 1930—if one allows for duplication, then, this line-up implies that only 11 books of importance on English literature after 1860 were published by general American and English presses in 1931. Of the 79 books discussed, 13 were published in 1930, and 4 were reprints. "The Year's Work," consequently, is represented by 62 books and 11 articles. For the same period, *M. H. R. A.* lists more than 1300 items, and omits about a hundred, a few of which (H. A. Jones's *Shadow of Henry Irving*, J. A. Fuller-Maitland's "Some Victorian Songs," F. Masson's *Victorians All*, D. Bobbé's *Fanny Kemble*) are of some importance.

For the reviewer of the Year's Work, obviously selection is necessary. And even if he does not content himself merely with such books as are sent to him, no selection can satisfy even the maker, especially in this century where amateurs, journalists and memorialists, still play in the field. For this reason, the reviewer needs to have anticipated open questions concerning his selections

and judgments to avoid the appearance of hit-or-miss-ness, of becoming a trade journalist for the university presses, or of wasting time simply by making explanations and transitions.

(1) Since selection is necessary and human strength limited, can a method be defined for representing the year's work? In every period, there are of course centers of activity, clustering about particular men or movements. In this period, for example, *M. H. R. A.* lists 28 items for Byron, more than for any other individual. Mr. Routh mentions none. And the score is 26 to 2 for the Coleridges, 24 to 0 for Poe, 22 to 4 for Dickens, 21 to 1 for Wordsworth, 19 to 2 for the Brownings, 17 to 1 for Jane Austen, 16 to 4 (including Lockhart) for Scott, 15 to 1 for the Carlyles, and so down the list to 12 to 1 for Shelley who is represented by Ullman's *Mad Shelley* (1930) rather than by Stovall's *Desire and Restraint* (1931). Meanwhile, according to Mr. Routh's representation, Annie Besant, Edmund Gosse, Julian Huxley, or Hartley Coleridge looms as large (or larger) in English letters as Coleridge, Poe, Wordsworth, Jane Austen, the Carlyles, Keats, Meredith, Tennyson, Arnold, or Shelley, a representation fair to 1931 in neither quantity nor quality. In addition, in particular years, owing to centennials or other circumstances, there are unusual points of activity. In 1931 the neo-humanist controversies wore themselves out with prolixity, for example, but though they were influential Mr. Routh mentions only one book on humanism, and that for a special reason. Finally, outstanding works like Sadleir's *Bulwer*, of which one can hardly help taking notice, give unusual flavor to a year's work. With judicious omissions and adjustments of space, a survey of these centers and points of activity might constitute a fair outline of the year's work and make reviewing it purposeful.

(2) Since selection is necessary, should not discussion be limited, perhaps only to works about English authors? Two books on Americans (Hawthorne and Emerson) are discussed, but with many another DeMille's *Literary Criticism in America*, perhaps a bit journalistic, is passed over. Mr. Routh tries to suggest correlations between studies in English and in metaphysics, religion, or sociology, reviews Hyde's *Prospects of Humanism* and Huxley's *What dare I think?*, commends a study in comparative literature, but mentions no English studies of French or German writers. Binyon's selections from Blake are discussed, but for the most part selections and editions go unnoticed. Watson's *Contemporary Comments* is considered illuminating for the romantic era; if so, why not Burton-Sitwell's *Victoriana* for the next? If Shaw's *Pen Portraits* or Chesterton's "George Bernard Shaw" is considerable, certainly then so are the Shaw-Terry letters, an outstanding book of the year. The usual reader of the *Year's Work*, I think, is apt to be sufficiently aware of proximities and varieties in annual English studies to want emphasis put on other characteristics and for



the sake of purposeful criticism to wish the scope of the *Work* clearly and systematically limited. Two years after 1931 we might do more than chat about it.

(3) To what audience, then, is the *Year's Work*, Chapter XII, directed? Is it supposed to appeal to the English specialist in his own field, in other fields in English than his own to provide outlines, or to lure neophyte readers to a love of English studies? On the answer to this open question depends in part the validity of general conclusion; that, for example, as personalities, rather than as scholars or stylists, romantic prose writers interested 1931 students. Mr. Routh looks for "style" in English studies, though it seems to me one should take for granted a decent mediocrity of style in students, whose primary concern comes necessarily to be with other matters. He inclines toward "humanism" (pp. 269, 270, 272, 279, 291, 299), a word he associates with humor, old-fashioned atmosphere, the personal, and even the picturesque and gossipy. He recommends "scholarship in parenthesis," studies which contribute perspectives rather than new facts, interpretations, or documents, studies of "more than academic interest." He even admires Bailey's *Introductions to Jane Austen* because it shows Bailey "at his best!" Yet chiefly because the method is "personal rather than critical," Ellis's *Collins, Lefanu, and Others* cannot be discussed. "Academic" seems to mean unoriginal (p. 266) or cluttered with immediately useless materials (p. 282) and dull.

One does not feel that Mr. Routh, though he writes pleasantly, has really defined for himself what he is trying to do or how to do it. As a matter of fact, some of the most "studied" work on 19th-century literature is being done in journal articles, of which Mr. Routh mentions only 11 and of which the only two from "learned journals" are from *MLN*.

ARTHUR E. DuBois

Duquesne University

---

*Legends of Angria.* Compiled from the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. By FANNIE E. RATCHFORD and WILLIAM CLYDE DE VANE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933. Pp. xviii + 332. \$3.50.

This is the most considerable collection of Brontë *juvenilia* which has yet been published. It contains four "long-short" stories and one narrative poem written by Charlotte Brontë between the ages of seventeen and twenty-three, and offers for the first time a representative selection of her contributions to that extraordinary cycle of *Angrian* literature which formed the background—or, as Miss Ratchford suggests, the main preoccupation—of her life from early childhood until shortly before she left for Brussels at

the age of twenty-six to fit herself for the profession of a school-mistress.

The origin and general character of the *Angrian* story are well known. Mrs. Gaskell quoted Charlotte's account of how the game of "making out" began in a present of toy soldiers to Branwell, and one or two separate pieces from Charlotte's pen have been published by Brontë editors. But the quantity of these early writings and the incredible elaboration of the themes as now exhibited in *Legends of Angria* come as something of a shock. The extent of the output may be gauged from Miss Ratchford's statement that the extant manuscripts from the period between Charlotte's fourteenth and twenty-fourth years aggregate more pages than her printed works, and that the year 1833, during which at the age of seventeen she wrote the earliest of the stories included in the present selection, was the most productive year of her life. Out of this mass of material, contained in the celebrated microscopic manuscripts scattered throughout the libraries of Europe and America, Miss Ratchford with Professor De Vane's help has made an intelligent and illuminating selection. Supplemented by an admirable descriptive commentary to fill in the gaps of the *Angrian* history, it presents a panorama of the complete world of the imagination which Charlotte and Branwell constructed and continually elaborated between them, and which, as Miss Ratchford is able to show by quotations from Charlotte's journals of the time, was for her the real world in which she lived and had her being through the dreary routine of life at Roe Head and the hardly less dreary intervals at the parsonage. This is perhaps the chief importance of *Legends of Angria*: it demonstrates completely the enormous hold which this world of the imagination had over Charlotte's mind in these early years. It gives a new point to the letter of Southey in which he warned her that "the day dreams in which she habitually indulged were likely to induce a distempered state of mind" and advised her to return to the world of real life with the words: "You will not seek in imagination for excitement, of which the vicissitudes of this life and the anxieties from which you must not hope to be exempted . . . will bring with them but too much." Southey's warning was laid to heart. The *Angrian* stories were given up, and Charlotte attempted no considerable composition between the last of the stories included in the present volume (written in the same year as Southey's letter) and the commencement of *The Professor* after her return from Brussels five years later. By the time she again took up the pen Southey's prophecy had been bitterly fulfilled. She had found in truth that she did not need to "seek in imagination for excitement," and all the passion which endless writing on the themes of her own heated imagination had not been able to quicken into life was released once and for all by suffering and the hard pressure of experience.

The quality of these early writings, to judge by the samples here

presented, is indeed exceedingly poor; one is almost inclined to say that the first merit of *Legends of Angria* is that it relieves one of the necessity of reading any more of them. Nevertheless, no Brontë lover can follow without interest the progress of Charlotte's mind from the crude gothicism of the earliest story — an amusing commentary this, with its apparatus of tournaments and unknown knights and subterranean dungeons, on Charlotte's dislike of Jane Austen, who could write *Northanger Abbey* at little more than the same age — to the full Byronesque flavour of the later stories, with their vivid foretaste of the future characterization of *Jane Eyre* and *Villette*. But even so the characters never come alive, and perhaps what emerges most sharply from reading these stories is the realization that Charlotte's greatest, and perhaps her only convincing, character was herself. But neither Charlotte nor Jane Eyre nor Lucy Snowe is to be found beneath the bizarre disguises of *Angria*. Charlotte needed life herself to breathe life into her characters, and it is remarkable that it should have been a literature of escape which absorbed her apprenticeship, while her real work did not begin until she was forced to allow herself a measure of autobiography.

By making it possible to set these early writings so clearly in perspective from the standpoint of Charlotte's later work, Miss Ratchford has made a real contribution to the understanding of Charlotte's genius, and her work deserves the gratitude of all Brontë students. It is much to be hoped that she will complete what she has begun by publishing an edition of the Journals, her quotations from which are perhaps the most exciting of all the discoveries which await the reader of the present volume.

P. D. PROCTOR

London

---

*Der Kranz, deutsche Gedichte aus den drei letzten Jahrhunderten.*

Unter Mitwirkung von Wilhelm Göcking ausgewählt von  
THEODOR ABELE und M. JOSEFA BÖHNERT. Paderborn:  
Ferdinand Schöningh (o. J). 584 pp. Mk. 5.

*German Romantic Lyrics.* Selected and edited by WALTER SILZ.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. xx + 319 pp.  
\$1.75.

*Romantische Lyrik. Nach Motiven ausgewählt und geordnet von*  
Dr. MARTIN SOMMERFELD. (= Literarhistorische Bibliothek  
Bd. 4.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1933. 185 pp.  
Mk. 4.80.

*Lyrische Weltdichtung in deutschen Übertragungen aus 7 Jahr-*

hundert. Ausgewählt von JULIUS PETERSEN und ERICH TRUNZ. (= Literarhistorische Bibliothek Bd. 9.) Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1933. 192 pp. Mk. 4.80.

*Der Kranz*, auf Dünndruckpapier in Antiqua gedruckt und in schmiegsames Leinen sehr hübsch gebunden, kann nicht vom Standpunkte einer allgemeinen Anthologie beurteilt werden. Seine Stärke, die nach der beschaulich-religiösen Seite liegt, ist zugleich seine Beschränkung. Wo Heine mit 2, Hebbel mit 3, Storm mit 6, Keller mit 5, Meyer mit 8 Gedichten, Haller überhaupt nicht, Hagedorn mit einem, Brookes mit einem Gedichte vertreten sind, können wir von vornherein damit rechnen, daß die Romantik voll ausgemünzt und der Barock ausgiebig behandelt ist. Schiller mit 84 Seiten steht gegen Goethe mit nur 60. Hier dürfte selbst bei Anerkennung des Standpunktes die Auswahl am angreifbarsten sein, denn *Der Gang nach dem Eisenhammer*, *Die Bürgschaft*, *Der Kampf mit dem Drachen* stehen zu weit hinter dem ausgelassenen *Ganymed* oder *Vermächtnis* im Werte zurück. Im Barock fehlen natürlich Stieler, Schirmer, aber auch jede Probe von Flemings Sonetten, selbst den religiösen. Raum gewonnen ist durch diese Unterdrückung für geistliche Lyrik wie Schnüffis' Marienlied, Anton Ulrichs "Es ist genug," für Jakob Balde und gewisse Volkslieder, die kaum in andern Sammlungen berücksichtigt worden sind; andererseits für jüngere Dichter derselben Richtung, deren Namen verhältnismäßig wenig bekannt sind neben Carossa, Billinger, George und Rilke. Der bürgerliche Realismus des 19. Jahrhunderts kommt am schlechtesten weg.

Von diesem festen Standpunkte aus rundet sich *Der Kranz* dann allerdings zu einem weltanschaulichen Ganzen und bietet mit manch gutem Funde eine glückliche Ergänzung zu den landläufigen Anthologien.

Mit kurzer aber anregender Einleitung und ausgiebigen, sachkundigen Anmerkungen bietet in ansprechendem Gewande Walter Silz seine Auswahl von German Romantic Lyrics. Die Verteilung ist mit guter Perspektive getroffen, Heine mit 40, Eichendorff mit 39, Uhland mit 35 Gedichten stehen an der Spitze. Bei Mörike dürfte die Zahl zu knapp (26), bei Lenau zu reichlich bemessen sein (32). Auch ist Brentano (10) gegen Rückert (17) vielleicht zu kurz gekommen. Das völlige Fehlen Friedrich Schlegels ist bei einer Romantikersammlung zu bedauern, desgleichen der Ausschuß von Arnims "Mir ist zu licht zum Schlafen" und Luise Hensels "Müde bin ich, geh zur Ruh." Und sollte nicht auch dem so viel gesungenen Zuccalmaglio ("Es fiel ein Reif," "Schwesterlein," "Feins Liebchen," "Die Blümelein schon schlafen") endlich ein Plätzchen in unsern Anthologien trotz seiner Bearbeiterrolle eingeräumt werden?

Die metrischen Bemerkungen Silz' (verwunderlich, da er auf

Heusler als seine Autorität hinweist) stützen sich auf veraltete und sehr heterogene Theorien. Opitz' Reform besteht nicht darin, daß er akzentuierte und unakzentuierte Silben für lange und kurze einsetzte (das würde voraussetzen, daß es im Deutschen im Grunde nicht immer so gewesen wäre), sondern daß er irrtümlicherweise für die deutsche Versbehandlung Alternierung verlangte und so zwar dem deutschen Verscharakter Gewalt antat, aber Ordnung in die Verwirrung brachte, die aus einer Stilmischung hervorgegangen war.

Oktameter gibt es eigentlich nicht (S. VII), über die Sechszahl geht unser Auffassungsvermögen nicht hinaus, und die Reihe zerfällt ganz von selbst in einen ungereimten und einen gereimten Tetrameter. Der Charakter des Knittelverses ist unauflöslich gebunden an Typen und Mischverscharakter, so daß demnach das Lenau'sche Gedicht "Die warme Luft, der Sonnenstrahl" nur den Mittelhochdeutschen Reimpaaren zugezählt werden kann, während Uhlands *Schwäbische Kunde* echte Knittelverse bringt. Der Knittelvers erlaubt indessen auch nicht "any number of unstressed syllables"; in ganz seltenen Fällen (Kapuzinerpredigt, die man aber am ehesten mit dem althochdeutschen Stabreimverse vergleichen kann) wird die Dreizahl erreicht.

Sommerfelds *Romantische Lyrik* sichtet und gruppiert das Material nach den bekannten Grundsätzen, wie sie sich im *Höfischen Lesebuch*, in der *Deutschen Lyrik von 1880-1930*, und der jetzt in zweiter vermehrter Auflage erschienenen *Deutschen Barocklyrik* für Seminarübungen hinreichend bewährt haben. Der Gesichtspunkt der "kollektiven Leistung" tritt hier besonders hervor.

Mit strenger Wahl schließt sich der 9. Band dieser Sammlung an, der 23 fremdsprachliche Vorbilder vom 23. Psalme an bis zu Swinburnes *Song*, von den antiken Sprachen über die Romanischen (leider mit Ausschluß des Spanischen!) bis zum Englischen, in vielen und zeitlich auseinanderliegenden deutschen Uebersetzungen bringt. Besonders erfreulich ist die praktische Druckanordnung, die es erlaubt, das fremdsprachliche Original jedesmal herauszufalten und so den Vergleich mit den Übertragungen zu erleichtern. Eine ausführliche Bibliographie mit Angabe weiterer Versuche ermöglicht die Ausdehnung der Arbeit, die selbst für amerikanische Studenten eine lohnende Aufgabe wäre und nicht weniger bedeutet als einen Überblick über die Entwicklung der deutschen Übersetzungskunst durch 5 Jahrhunderte.

Es wäre außerordentlich wünschenswert, wenn die Sammlung noch ein gleiches Bändchen für das Drama brächte, zumal ein Bändchen, welches die Eroberung Shakespeares darstellte.

ERNST FEISE

*La Poésie lyrique des Troubadours.* By ALFRED JEANROY. Two volumes. Paris: Henri Didier and Toulouse: Edouard Privat, 1934. Pp. viii + 812.

This is the most comprehensive survey of the troubadour lyric to appear since that of Diez, and accordingly is the only modern attempt to coördinate and appraise on a large scale the scattered material which has been made available during the last hundred years in new editions of the poems, in critical studies and in historical discoveries concerning the poets' lives and times. Needless to say, the wide-ranging knowledge of the author, his rare sanity and sound judgment will make these two volumes indispensable to all Romance scholars.

Volume I, after a preliminary sketch of Provençal studies from the sixteenth century to the present and a short chapter on the language of the troubadours, is devoted to questions of origin, of the credence to be given the ancient biographies, and of the diffusion of the Provençal lyric in France and across the borders. A list of troubadours by regions and a bio-bibliographical list (largely superceded by the new Pillet-Carstens' *Bibliographie der Troubadours*) complete this part of the work. Volume II takes up the more important poets and discusses the various types of poetry that they wrote.

It is difficult to examine within reasonable limits so comprehensive and detailed a work, every page of which is tightly packed with the results of the fruitful erudition of the author, and in what follows only some of the more important conclusions can be suggested. J. opposes the theory that the common language of the troubadours derives from Limousin and sees in it rather a *lingua franca* understandable throughout the whole region ruled at the end of the twelfth century by the counts of Toulouse, "où un commencement de centralisation politique avait pu entraîner un commencement d'unité linguistique" (I, 52). His deductions regarding the origins of the Provençal lyric are reasonable and conservative: "l'art des troubadours, poétique et musical, est donc né . . . d'une étroite collaboration entre un public de grands seigneurs animé de goûts littéraires et une classe de professionnels doués d'un esprit assez souple et inventif pour avoir pu s'adapter à ces goûts" (I, 88). One would have welcomed a more extensive investigation here, e. g. a differentiation between matter and technique, and a discussion of the possible influence of church music, liturgical texts, mediaeval schools of rhetoric and the secular lyrics of the clerks. (Hilka and Schumann's new edition of the *Carmina Burana* and Strecker's of the *Cambridge Songs* have brought some chronological order into the chaos that is posited in I, 80; in II, 284 J. himself connects the *pastourelle* with secular Latin poems;



two articles of Scheludko are cited, but not those in *ZFSL.*, 52 [1929], 1, 201, and *Arch Rom.*, xv [1931], 137, nor those of Spanke in *ZFSL.*, 51 [1928], 73; 53 [1930], 113; 54 [1931], 282, 385; and in *ZRP.*, 51 [1931], 309.)

The ancient biographies are relegated to the ignominious place generally assigned them today, but J. agrees with Stronski in thinking they may nevertheless be relied upon to a great extent for facts about the troubadours' provenance and social condition (I, 101; cf. J.'s own article in *Arch Rom.*, I, 1917, 289, which he does not cite, and the prudent words of O. H. Moore in *PMLA.*, 29, 1914, 518). J. seemingly accepts, though he does not discuss, the derivation of *trobar* from *tropare* (I, 135). His important researches concerned with the diffusion of the Provençal lyric in Spain, Portugal, Italy and Germany must be left to specialists in the literatures of those countries to evaluate. The difficulty of stating how contacts occurred even between the north and south of France is evident from I, 266 f.; J. rejects the possibility of border contacts and minimizes the rôle of the crusades, attributing the introduction of Provençal poetry in the north to "snobisme aristocratique" and emphasizing the preponderance of noblemen among the poets.

In volume II, various troubadours are neatly characterized: Arnaut Daniel is the "coryphée du 'trobar ric'" (II, 49), Peire Vidal is "un vrai gamin de Paris, il y a déjà l'étoffe d'un Marot" (155), Bertran de Born is "un condottiere besogneux et sans scrupules, qui se trouvait être un poète de génie" (199), and these few citations will perhaps serve to indicate the literary charm and distinction of a work that is essentially learned. Moreover, J. repeatedly shows that while he is fully appreciative of the troubadours' merits, he is under no illusions about their poetical vices, their conventional imagery, stereotyped forms and formulae, lack of sincerity and the power of fresh observation. Such extravagant admirers of the troubadour lyric as Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot would do well to ponder the words of this specialist.

In the pages devoted to the various types of lyric J.'s observations about the *genres dialogués* (II, 247 f.) and the *chansons de danse* (297 f.) are of special interest: he attributes a possible northern origin to the *partimen* (260-1) and indicates the importance of the north in the development of the late Provençal *pastourelles* (291); he classifies the *chansons à toile* and the *chansons de mal mariée* with the *chansons de danse*, believes the *aube* and *pastourelle* also furnished themes for songs written to accompany dancing, and reasons from the relative scarcity of such songs among the thirteenth century Provençal lyrics either that the Midi did less dancing to song than the north or that, more probably, social life, because of political circumstances, was less intense there at this time (303). The final chapters of the work

are devoted to religious poetry and to the disappearance of the troubadour lyric, the extinction of which is plausibly equated with the overthrow of the old nobility and the rise to power of foreigners, ignorant and disdainful of both the Provençal language and literature.

No summary, especially one emphasizing controversial points only, can hope to do justice to this magnificent undertaking. Scholars may disagree with the author's inferences here and there, they may detect in these volumes various bibliographical omissions, they will doubtless regret the inconvenient arrangement of the work and the absence of any index, but they cannot fail to be grateful to him for having gathered this vast store of material together, for having made accessible the results of his own extensive researches and his judicious estimates of the contributions of others, in short, for having irradiated the whole sphere of Provençal studies with his wisdom, his sensibility and his charm.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois.* Par WALTHER VON WARTBURG. Paris: Droz, 1934. Pp. 140. (Société de publications romanes et françaises VIII.)

The publication of the monumental *Atlas linguistique de la France* by Gilliéron and Edmont has not only stimulated the compilation of many glossaries of local dialects, but it has also aroused imitation outside of France. The numerous investigations of these patois, many of which are obsolescent, are now being studied in their entirety, together with normal French, by Professor W. von Wartburg in his *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Consequently no one is better qualified to present a systematic bibliography of the Gallo-Romance dialects. The *Bibliographie des dictionnaires patois* is a reference-work which will be very useful to every student of Romance philology. [Incidentally, the present reviewer has completed a companion bibliography entitled *Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français*.]

The titles are divided into four logical groups: généralités, français, franco-provençaux, provençaux. The subdivisions are made on linguistic, historical, and geographic criteria. The map not only reproduces the numbers for the places studied in the *A. L. F.*, but indicates the other localities for which lexica are available. An alphabetical list of all the places covers pages 131-141. It is to be noted that in addition to recording printed works, Wartburg also enters the titles of many glossaries still in manuscript form. The scope of this enterprise and the facility with which the reader is enabled to consult it make it worthy of the highest praise.

On page 11 Wartburg enumerates the five bibliographies which attempted to cover the field of French dialectology. Although they lack many of the titles contained in the present bibliography, they were made too extensive by virtue of including works not of a lexicographical nature. The most serviceable of the five was the one compiled by Wartburg himself in 1929 in order to indicate the sources of his *Frz. etym. Wtb.* A sixth one worthy of mention is the collection of Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte, now in the Newberry Library of Chicago. The catalogue of it by V. Collins (London, 1894), pp. 175-232, records approximately 1000 items. The present repertory offers 1101 items, some of which will now be discussed.

Instead of the inadequate treatment given to argot in items 23-34, 646, 748, it would seem preferable to note the bibliography for French slang by A. Dauzat, *Les Argots* (Paris, 1929), pp. 171-3; neither Wartburg nor Dauzat cites E. Chautard, *La Vie étrange de l'argot* (Paris, 1931); W. Hunger, *Argot* (Leipzig, 1917); O. Leroy, *A Glossary of French Slang* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1922); L. Sainéan, *L'Argot des tranchées* (Paris, 1915). 190, L. F. Daire's *Dictionnaire* is appended to his *Histoire des Doyennés du Diocèse d'Amiens*. Items 194 and 195 should be combined. 331 is entitled *Glossaire étym. et hist. des patois et des parlers de l'Anjou*. For an analysis of 367, cf. *Speculum*, VII (1932), 439. 369 was edited by J. H. Burgaud des Marets. 381, H. A. Major and W. A. Pickens are preparing a *Glossary of Louisiana French*. 383, Rougé's *Le Parler tourangeau*, appeared in 1912 at Paris. 450 was reedited by F. Fertault (Paris, 1842). Offprints have appeared of 493 Piétrement, *Le Patois Briard* (Paris, 1888) and 541 Piquet, *Le Patois de Dombas* (Paris, 1929). 549, the complete title is H. Labourasse, *Glossaire abrégé du patois de la Meuse, notamment de celui de Vouthis* (Arcis-sur-Aube, 1887). The fact that certain items (e.g., 646 and 677) form "fascicules" of the *Bibl. école h. études* is not indicated. In 648, p. 744 is a misprint for p. 844. The index to 769 is found in vol. II, pp. 769-778. Item 810 was issued separately as *Dictionnaire du patois de Lallé* (Gap, 1909). 1101, the author's name is Ducéré.

No mention is found of the following lexica: J. Hennig, *Die frz. Sprache im Munde der Belgier und die Marollenmundart Brüssels* (Heidelberg, 1926); T. Hersart de la Villemarqué, *Dict. breton-fran. de Le Gonidec* (St. Brieuc, 1850); A. E. Troude, *Nouveau dict. pratique breton-fran.* (Brest, 1876); A. H. Schutz, "The Peasant Voc. in the Works of George Sand," *Univ. Missouri Studies*, II, No. 1 (1927); T. Mignard, *Hist. de l'idiotisme bourguignon* (Dijon, 1856); M. Barthès, *Glossaire botanique languedocien-fran.-latin de l'arr. de St.-Pons* (Montpellier, 1873).

In the "Liste des Auteurs" a few names need to be revised as follows: Bruneau 509, Collard 140, Duméril, Haust pp. 11 and 17, Jaubert 396, Rohlf 906, Simonet, Violet 442-3. The "Liste des Vocabulaires Spéciaux" is limited to generic terms, and should be lengthened to include individual authors (e.g. 450) and word-studies (e.g. 9). Since it refers to Judaeo-Provençal (837, 842), it might not be amiss to note the bibliography of 70 sources for mediaeval Judaeo-French in *Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive* (Baltimore, 1932), pp. 10-12.

These comments merely reflect the importance of Wartburg's *Bibliographie* and do not detract at all from its great utility and splendid presentation.

RAPHAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

*From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman.* By M. K. POPE. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1934. Pp. xxix + 571. (French Series VI.)

The latest work by Professor M. K. Pope of the University of Manchester reflects perspicacious application and boundless patience in a field which certainly is not unploughed, but where keen discernment is needed to separate the rank weeds from the lush growth. A brief review can not do justice to Professor Pope's detailed investigation of the evolution of phonology and morphology from Latin to the refined French of the seventeenth century, together with an outline of the history of orthography. This valuable contribution to the study of the French language deserves high recommendation as a reference-work for teachers and as collateral reading for graduate students.

Professor Pope has drawn freely upon her predecessors, in particular upon Brunot, Meyer-Lübke, Nyrop, and Tanqueray, but her method of compilation and of presentation is original. The principal divisions of this compendium are: I External History of the Language (§ 1-92), which seems to be less profound than other treatises on the same subject; II Phonology (§ 93-687), covering all changes of vowels and consonants and concluding with a comprehensive Table of Sounds; III Orthography (§ 688-746), traced from the ninth through the seventeenth century; IV Morphology (§ 747-1067), including an extensive Table of Verbs; V Anglo-Norman (§ 1068-1319), which emphasizes the influence of the indigenous tongue upon the development of French in England and which offers a succinct survey of sounds, declensions, and conjugations; VI An Appendix (§ 1320-1329), which summarizes conveniently the dialectal traits of northern and western France to which reference has been made *passim*.

The main processes underlying the phonetic and morphological evolution stand out in relief, while controversial questions and dialectal variants are given a subordinate position by the use of small type. If time is at a premium, the student can follow easily the general course of this development by itself and omit the details. A most praiseworthy innovation is the constant documentation for the changes in sound and flexion by quotations from mediaeval texts and from contemporary grammarians. A mere list of linguistic phenomena without concrete examples would correspond to a skeleton as closely as a dictionary limited to words and their meanings.

A decided preference for the analytical to the synthetic is quite proper in the body of this manual. On the other hand, the bibliographies fused with the abbreviations have too many subdivisions. The lists of titles might be combined alphabetically, retaining the chronological indications. All the scattered abbreviations could be

assembled in one general group at the beginning. Likewise the Index of Verbs is unnecessarily separated from the Word-Index.

It might not be amiss to revise some of the titles. Page xxi, *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ed. W. Suchier (1932); Bernard: combine Schulze ed. of Berlin MS. with Foerster ed. of Paris MS. [p. xxiii; the Nantes MS. is described by L. Delisle, *Journal des savants* (mars 1900), pp. 148-164]. xxii, E. S. Tyler, ed. *La Chançon de Willame* (New York, 1919); A. Bayot, ed. *Poème Moral* (Bruxelles, 1929). xxvi, J. Streicher, *Vaugelas: fac-similé de l'éd. originale avec index* (Paris, 1934). xxvii, Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Gram. frz. Spr.* (1913). xxviii, Schwan & Behrens, *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen* (Leipzig, 1925); F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* . . . 10, Müller, *Zts. rom. Ph.*, Beiheft 78 (1929). 21, M. A. Pei, *The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in N. France* (New York, 1932). 48, *Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive* (Baltimore, 1932). 483, Gaimar, ed. A. Bell (Manchester, 1925). 486, W. von Wartburg, *Bibl. dict. patois* (Paris, 1934).

RAPHAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

---

*Three French Dramatists, Racine, Marivaux, Musset.* By ARTHUR TILLEY, Cambridge: University Press. Pp. ix + 206.

Gladstone saw nothing in Molière's masterpieces but third-class plays and the great Liberal leader's countrymen have always displayed a remarkable indifference to many of Molière's contemporaries, especially to Racine. Professor Tilley has desired to increase the admiration for Racine and his two spiritual descendants, Marivaux and Musset, and in his *Three French Dramatists* has given us one of the best introductions to the dramatists concerned that we have in English. He groups the three together, since each shows a profound interest in psychology, a strong dramatic sense, and a highly individualistic style. Because the appreciation of their plays comes only with careful perusal and minute study, T. confines himself almost exclusively to a detailed analysis of each of the plays, excluding all else save a few biographical details. His great familiarity with all of the works of the three writers, his keen insight, and his enthusiasm should arouse the interest of indifferent Anglo-Saxons to the merits of these dramatists, so typically French and so highly valued in their own country. If he does not attain his goal, one must lay the fault to the idiosyncracies of national and racial tastes in matters of all forms of art and more especially literature. One finds it difficult, however, to determine the class of reader whom T. had in mind, as he wrote the book. To one unfamiliar with the subject, the many analyses of plots, in spite of much skill and penetration, will not prove sufficiently interesting to hold the attention, while the close student of French literature will find all the material in more extended form in three

critics, Lemaître for Racine, Larroumet for Marivaux, and Lafoscade for Musset, to all of whom T. acknowledges his indebtedness.

His enthusiasm sometimes leads him astray. He feels, for example, that modern novelists, however proficient in Freudian psychology, 'might profit from a study of these careful explorers of the human heart' but he does not realize that the Freudian novelist approaches his subject from an entirely different point of view, which makes comparison impossible. T. feels that the Englishman must be conscious of the merits of Racine. In discussing *Esther* he writes: "Even a foreigner can appreciate the beauty of the style and the music of the verse . . . the verse flows on like a limpid stream, making music as it flows." The music of the verse of *Esther* occasions a repetition of this remark: "Its high quality is recognized by all Frenchmen and even a foreigner can appreciate it." One could cite much to disprove these statements concerning the ability of the foreigner, especially the Anglo-Saxon, to appreciate this aspect of Racine's poetry. As Paul Valéry says: "Racine leur (les étrangers) est interdit. Ses harmonies sont trop subtiles." F. Y. Eccles in his Taylorian Lecture, *Racine in England*, finds Racine too essentially French for England: Racine is "a poet of his own soil, the flower of a certain civilization: nor do those who love him best in France seek to impose their admiration on the world at large. They know how little of him is fit for export." Jules Lemaître held a similar opinion and C. J. Baily wrote *The Claims of French Poetry* to win the appreciation of the non-dramatic French verse on the part of the English reader who has acquired an aversion to all French poetry because of a dislike of French dramatic verse. Englishmen have sometimes grown enthusiastic over a performance of a play of Racine, especially *Phèdre*, but, in such instances, it is probably the actress in the leading rôle rather than Racine who causes the enthusiasm. The poet Gray and Horace Walpole both praised very highly Mlle Dumesnil in the rôle of *Phèdre* and Mlle Clairon, in the same rôle, caused Charlotte Brontë to "shudder to the marrow of her bones." It would have been very interesting, had T. given us a few such statements of English writers as to their opinions on Racine.

Marivaux presents perhaps more difficulties than Racine for the Englishman who finds 'marivaudage' to be rather much ado about nothing in particular. Even in France the number of Marivaux's admirers is restricted. T. even suspects that d'Alembert, when he speaks of the comedies written in 'ce singulier jargon,' had never read or seen any of them performed. Frenchmen still remember La Harpe's famous remark on Marivaux's plays: "On sourit mais on bâille." Admitting with T. that *Le Jeu de l'Amour et du Hasard* is a play of many merits, English taste will still prefer to the delicately drawn characters of Marivaux the robust men and women of *She Stoops to Conquer*, compared with whom Silvia and Dorante seem like faded pastels.



Musset, with his reminiscences of Shakespeare, should have made a greater appeal to England. His plays, as T. states, are "within their limits, masterpieces" but England probably knows Musset, not as a dramatist, but as the lover of George Sand. His comedies, so light, fantastic, and poetic, remain, notwithstanding T's analysis, like the plays of Racine and Marivaux, too delicate and fragile for export.

In spite of this very worthy effort on the part of Professor Tilley to overcome a national prejudice, English-speaking peoples will undoubtedly continue to ignore the existence of these three so typically French dramatists. Taine, as he takes leave of his reader in *l'Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, accepts complacently the limitations of his literary taste. Sentiment rather than reason forms the basis of his own preference of Musset over Tennyson and also of the Englishman's indifference to Racine, Marivaux, and Musset.

JAMES F. MASON

Cornell University

---

*Collin d'Harleville Dramatist.* By LAURENCE HERVEY SKINNER.

New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies,  
1933. 202 pp.

Dr. Skinner's dissertation conveys, at times, a reasonable estimate of Collin's works. It betrays, however, the earmarks of haste, for one finds in it lengthy analyses (*Inconstant*, 8 pp.; *Vieux célibataire*, 10), excessive quotations (12-14, 26-27, 160-162), superfluous comments (116, 118, 120, 122), repetitions and digressions (166, 186, 187), suggesting a monograph blown into a book—an inflation the more apparent since it is not readily seen what S. contributes to the knowledge of the subject. Language, organization (conclusion re-opens discussion), handling of references (catalogue-wise), inaccuracies, lack of perspective are testimonies of insufficient preparation.

S. has it (69-70) that M. Lanson rated Collin a follower of Molière. Indeed, after stating that Molière did not satisfy Boileau, M. Lanson adds that Boileau's precept regarding expression "mène à la comédie spirituelle . . . : Destouches . . . Collin." M. Lanson goes on to say (*op. cit.*, 505-506): "[Boileau] trouve [Molière] . . . trop grossièrement vivant. Voilà la grande erreur . . . de Boileau." M. Lanson is not exactly handing the palm to Collin. S. would have done well to ignore completely M. Lanson, whose judgment, "la comédie classique en vers ira s'évanouir dans les pâles œuvres des Collin d'Harleville . . ." (*id.*, 816) does not encourage the notion of a Collin reviving Molière (173).

From the fact that Collin's "Return to nature" "means return to a simple . . . life" the conclusion is drawn that Collin's

Rousseauism is a "somewhat provincial and bourgeois Rousseauism—devoid of strife . . ." (178): S. overlooks that such also is the Rousseauism of Rousseau.

Apropos of *l'Inconstant* S. asserts that "success . . . depended upon the wit and brilliance of style and the originality in conception and treatment" (173). After analysis he concedes "invraisemblance, feeble structure," etc. (84). Is it then the "wit and brilliance of style" which brought success?—Not exactly: "the wit and gaiety . . . freshness of the style" (81); "facility and grace of the verse" (82); "facile versification not lacking in grace and elegance" (84); "facile and natural dialogue" (92); "simplicity and grace" (175); "frankness and naïvete" (179).

It is regrettable that S. does not specify the passage in *le Misanthrope* of which he is reminded by the lines,

En flatteurs caressés, cet Univers abonde . . .  
mon poison, grâce au ciel,  
Dans le cœur du papa se glisse à la sourdine;  
Il m'aime enfin; et c'est chez le papa qu'on dîne. (106)

One would like to see the two speeches side by side.

Two instances set the mark of S.'s enthusiasm. He acclaims as "irrevocably stated" the opinion, "*Le Vieux célibataire . . . la meilleure comédie . . . depuis Molière*" (44); and the opinion, "Collin a trouvé dans une comédie . . . un caractère dont il a tiré grand parti" (128) must be attributed to envy; Collin's own dismay "at the close resemblance" cannot assuage the biographer's indignation. Collin being indirectly responsible for *le Philinte* of Fabre d'Églantine, *le Philinte* finds itself "often cited as one of the two best comedies produced in the Revolutionary period" (182). The other best . . . "would be *le Vieux célibataire*." One may wonder whether Collin would have liked the association.

When one turns from the works to the personality of Collin the impression of Dr. Skinner's study changes. Collin the man, amiable, generous, upright, is, throughout the book, adequately, though not always concisely, presented.

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

*Le Débat romantique en France, 1813-1830.* Par EDMOND EGGLI et PIERRE MARTINO. Tome I, 1813-1816, par E. Egli. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1933. Pp. 498.

There has been a definite attempt in the last few decades, beginning with Ch.-M. Des Granges' *Presse littéraire sous la Restauration*,<sup>1</sup> to give a greater feeling of actuality to the Romantic-Classical struggle of the early nineteenth century by presenting it as

<sup>1</sup> Paris, 1907.

depicted in the Press of the Period.<sup>2</sup> More stress has likewise been laid on the importance of the chronological order of articles dealing with this question. Particularly helpful in this respect is the recent work of M. René Bray: *Chronologie du romantisme* (1804-1830).<sup>3</sup> The authors of the series of which this present work is volume I, proceeding along this same line, propose to bring together in available form the most significant pamphlets, manifestos, and Press articles dealing with Romanticism, especially those which are not of easy access. The magnitude of the proposed task is evident from the fact that volume I covers only the first four years of the period selected (1813-1830).

MM. Eggli and Martino have shown good judgment in beginning with 1813, the year in which three important polemic works make their appearance in rapid succession in France: (1) Sismondi's *De la littérature du Midi de l'Europe* (I-II, May 7, 1813; III-IV, June 4), Schlegel's *Cours de littérature dramatique* (Dec. 10, 1813), Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* (Nicolle, Paris, May 21, 1814). We know, of course, that the term "romantisme" in its full technical sense does not come into free usage until after Augier's *Discours sur le romantisme*, April 24, 1824, and that Victor Hugo that same year makes the frequently quoted statement in the *Préface* to his *Odes et Ballades* that he "ignore profondément ce que c'est que le genre classique et que le genre romantique." However, we know that the controversy had been waging for ten years previous to that date with the opponents lined up and employing definite terms such as "poésie romantique, théâtre romantique," etc., and even the categorical expressions "école classique" and "école romantique."<sup>4</sup> The choice of the date 1830 to close the series is the natural one since after the Revolution of July, the public is more interested in other questions, and the discussion in regard to the new School becomes less intense.

The ordinary method of procedure adopted by M. Eggli in his presentation of the material is as follows: (1) a commentary on the status of the question at the time of the appearance in France of the book or article under discussion, (2) the work itself reprinted *in extenso* or analyzed, (3) Press criticism. In a concise Introduction he emphasizes the confusion of ideas existing in France in regard to Romanticism in the early years of the nineteenth century. In Germany by 1813 there existed a definite Romantic doctrine,

<sup>2</sup> Other noteworthy publications in the same field are the following: J. Marsan, *La Muse française*, 1907-9; H. F. Stewart and A. Tilley, *The Romantic Movement in French Literature*, 1910; P. van Tieghem, *Le mouvement romantique*, 1912; Helen M. King, *Les doctrines littéraires de la Quotidienne*, 1920; P. Trahard, *Le romantisme défini par le Globe*, 1924; J. Marsan, *Le Conservateur littéraire*, 1926.

<sup>3</sup> Paris, 1932.

<sup>4</sup> Employed in the prospectus of the *Journal général de France*, which first appeared Sept. 1, 1814.

while in France it was not until about 1820 that definite attempts were made to formulate a doctrine. Previous to that date scholars were content to accept the position of Sébastien Mercier, who declared in 1801 in his *Néologie* "On sent le romantique, on ne le définit pas." Such was the condition of affairs when in 1813 the appearance of the three works mentioned before gave the impression in France of a concerted attack against the hegemony of the French classic literature in Europe. In keeping with this idea the author has adopted as the general title for volume I of the series "L'Offensive du romantisme allemand et la réaction française."<sup>5</sup>

The work of Sismondi, which appeared in France six months before that of Schlegel, was received at first, on account of its liberal tone and lack of aggressiveness, without great bitterness. When the *Cours de littérature dramatique* appeared, however, making it evident that Sismondi had obtained many of his ideas from the German production, the tone changed. The movement was conceived as "délibérément antifrçais." One critic, Dussault, even suggested that the two writers were in collusion in an attack on French literature (*Journal de l'Empire*, March 11, 1814). National feeling was intensified by the fact that the allied armies were in France at this time. When the *De l'Allemagne* appeared, it was impossible not to associate it with the preceding two works, and with but rare exceptions it received similar hostile treatment. One exception was the laudatory pamphlet *Les scrupules littéraires de Mme la baronne de Staël*, by Alexandre Soumet (Oct. 22, 1814). This is one of the three productions which M. Eggli has published in full (pp. 217-240). Two months later, there appeared in *Le Spectateur* (Dec. 1814) an article by Antoine Jay, probably inspired by Soumet's pamphlet, praising French classic literature and attacking Shakespeare and the Romanticists. This article entitled *Discours sur le genre romantique* is also reprinted in this present volume (pp. 243-256).

In the year 1815, the critics cease to emphasize so strongly the idea of the foreign literary invasion and the question is debated more on its literary merits. In 1816, the discussion becomes more general in scope and more French in character. The work most influential perhaps in keeping the debate alive in the year 1816 was the celebrated *Anti-Romantique* of Saint-Chamans (Dec. 23, 1815), the last of the three important works reproduced *in extenso* by Professor Eggli (pp. 317-447).

The latter part of the volume is devoted to discussion in the Press of Romanticism in general, to articles dealing with the *Adolphe* of Benjamin Constant (June 22, 1816), the *Voyage en Angleterre* of L. Simond (April 27, 1816), and the translation by J. G. Hess of Schiller's *Maria Stuart* (July 20, 1816). In several

<sup>5</sup> Professor Eggli has previously treated some phases of this subject in his work on *Schiller et le romantisme français*, 1927.

of the newspaper articles we find a discussion of Shakespeare and occasional references to other English writers. While a full treatment of English influence belongs in the later volumes of the series dealing with the period when the works of Scott and Byron have their vogue in France, a short chapter on that phase of the question would have been welcome in this book.

M. Eggli has made a valuable contribution to the literature on Romanticism. He has made an excellent choice of subjects from a chaotic mass of material and has presented them with scholarly accuracy. The entire work is well documented. Scholars in this field will look forward to the completion of the series.

*University of Illinois*

D. H. CARNAHAN

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries.* Edited by M. M. KNAPPEN. Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1933. Pp. xiii + 148. \$3.00. The diaries here edited from little-known manuscripts were kept by Richard Rogers, Puritan lecturer of Essex (1551-1618), from 1587 to 1590 and Samuel Ward, master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (1572-1643), from 1595 to 1599 (with a few jottings down to 1640). They are altogether dismal reading. In each the great events of Elizabethan literature and history are ignored, so that students interested in those subjects will find almost nothing of value. But the book is described as the second volume of *Studies in Church History*, and no doubt it will interest students of religion, for whom it was primarily intended. Mr. Knappen's editorial work deserves praise. The mere deciphering of the diaries was, to judge from his facsimiles, a laborious task; and he has contributed full and well-documented lives of Rogers and Ward, amplifying and correcting the sketches in the *DNB.*, as well as a valuable essay on "The Puritan Character as Seen in the Diaries" that is far more entertaining than the manuscripts on which it is based.

HYDER E. ROLLINS

*Harvard University*

---

*Elizabethan Book-Pirates.* By CYRIL BATHURST JUDGE. Harvard Studies in English, VIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1934. Pp. xiv + 198. \$2.50. This volume is a distinguished addition to a distinguished series. Dr. Judge's discussion of various lawsuits which agitated the Stationers' Company during the reign of Elizabeth throws

valuable new light upon the ethics and general conduct of the London book trade in its earliest organized period. The cases treated illustrate the operation of the objectionable monopolistic system which clogged the progress of the printers' art in England and came near justifying the piracies that it encouraged. The last case, that of Simon Stafford in 1597-1598, shows the Stationers' Company emerging from its place of juniority among the London guilds and establishing its paramount right to handle the distribution of books, as against the traditional claims of the members of older companies (such as, in Stafford's case, the Drapers). Dr. Judge's book is a valuable supplement to the new *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576 to 1602*, printed by Dr. Greg and Miss Boswell in 1930 and to Mr. H. R. Hoppe's monograph on John Wolfe in *The Library*, December, 1933. It gives us—not indeed the formal history of the Elizabethan Stationers' Company, which is still a desideratum—but certainly the most lucid and readable account yet available of the way in which the Company met some of its chief crises. The documents, printed here for the first time, are of real interest and appear to be very faithfully transcribed.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

---

*Der Prosastil in den Märchen Clemens Brentanos.* Von Dr. ILSE MAHL. (= Germanische Studien Heft 110.) Berlin: Ebering, 1931. 131 pp. Mk. 5. Der Inhalt dieser Studie geht über den zu eng gewählten Titel hinaus, denn sie bespricht Themen und Phantasiegehalt der Märchen, Komposition und weltanschaulichen Gehalt, bevor sie den Stil des sprachlich-künstlerischen Ausdrucks untersucht und auf Grund dieser Analyse das Verhältnis der Märchen untereinander sowie ihre Stellung in der Märchenliteratur feststellt. Die Arbeit bewegt sich auf sicherem Tatsachengrunde ohne Spitzfindigkeiten, allerdings auch hier und da ohne philosophische und psychologische Vertiefung und Fingerspitzengefühl. Stärker hätte sicher das Verhältnis Brentanos zu seinem Kinderpublikum berücksichtigt werden können in Anbetracht seines Improvisationstalentes. Sobald ein Märchenerzähler über die traditionelle Art des Volksmärchens hinausgeht, wird er zur Veranschaulichung, realistischer Einbeziehung von Zügen des täglichen Lebens gedrängt, eine Realistik, die nicht ursprünglich literarischer Art ist, sondern an die Sinnlichkeit des Kindes appelliert. Sobald der traditionelle Weg verlassen ist, ist der sprühenden Phantasie Brentanos Tür und Tor geöffnet.

Wertvoll und einleuchtend ist die chronologische Ordnung der Märchen auf Grund der durch die Analyse gewonnenen Einsichten im fünften Kapitel der Studie, die den Weg Brentanos vom Volks-



mäßigen zu immer größerer Komplizierung, zu Manier und endlich zu christlich-ethischer Didaktik nachzeichnet.

ERNST FEISE

---

*The Wits; or, Sport upon Sport.* Edited by JOHN JAMES ELSON. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1932. Pp. xiv + 440. \$4.50. Dr. Elson is to be congratulated on a handsome and scholarly edition of this celebrated Restoration miscellany. Everyone has heard of the "drolls," but few have read them. The editor presents them in carefully collated texts, with ample citation of their verbal departures from the parent plays and with notes bibliographical and critical.

H. S.

---

*The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare.* By EDWIN ELIOT WILLOUGHBY. (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, No. 8.) At the Oxford University Press, for the Bibliographical Society, 1932. Pp. xvi + 70. This admirable monograph is "a first step" toward the performance of a task which has its importance for the textual critic: the different passages of [the First Folio] should be assigned to the journeymen who composed them, and a careful study should then be made of the typographical habit of each compositor [in order to] render the textual criticism of over half of the plays of Shakespeare more impersonal and certain than it is at present.

Dr. Willoughby's contribution consists of an examination of typographical practices in the Jaggards' shop, a modification of Mr. Satchell's suggestions (*TLS.*, June 3, 1920) for distinguishing the compositors, a consideration of the proof-reading based on the Folger Library's corrected page (352) of *Anthony and Cleopatra* and the original settings of the last page of *Romeo and Juliet* and the first of *Troilus and Cressida* in the Toovey-Morgan copy, the establishing of a time-table for the printing, a reconstruction of the order in which the plays were handled, and the conclusion that difficulties with various owners of portions of the copy (rather than carelessness on the part of the printer) caused certain irregularities such as the placing of *Troilus and Cressida* at the head of the tragedies. Dr. Willoughby's grand conclusion is reassuringly optimistic: we need not suppose "that the compositors and proof-readers of the First Folio introduced any great corruption into the text." The value of this brochure is enhanced by facsimiles of the three pages mentioned, and by a reproduction of the slightly broken tailpiece on which the author builds an ingenious argument for the suspension of work on the Folio during an interval of about fourteen months. It is to be hoped that, having made the "first step" with such success, Dr. Willoughby will undertake the heroic task of trying to reach the goal he describes in the quotation at the head of this notice.

H. S.

*Die französischen Ödipusdramen. Ein Beitrag zum Fortleben der Antike und zur Geschichte der französischen Tragödie.* Von WOLFGANG JÖRDENS. Bochum-Langendreer, 1933. Pp. viii + 149. This is an antebellum type of German dissertation with long analyses and discussions of structure, and with numerous quotations from critics. The fortunes of *Œdipus tyrannus* are traced from Corneille to Cocteau; those of *Œdipus at Colonus* from Garnier to Gide. The work is done with pains and conscience. At times, however, the batteries shell the wrong objective, for the reader is willing to believe that *Œdipus tyrannus* is a great play, without the O. K. of Jebb and Wilamowitz (p. 1), while he remains skeptical of the statement that Corneille knew Sophocles only in translation when it is supported by a mere reference (p. 23) to his "Théâtre choisi, Paris, 1930." I may add that it is misleading to say (p. 29) that only in *Œdipe* and in *Médée* did Corneille draw tragic material from Greek mythology, as he also wrote *Andromède* and the *Toison d'or*, both of which he called tragedies; and that, if Herr Jördens had read d'Aubignac's diatribe against *Œdipe*, he would have realized that Corneille did not sacrifice so much to the tastes of his contemporaries as most of the scholars he cites seem to think. In the Abbé's outraged opinion Corneille modernized *Œdipus* so little that he allowed him, prince though he was, to cross Greece alone, without a valet to give him his slippers and his "bonnet de nuit"!.

H. C. L.

---

*University of Texas Studies in English* (Number 13). Austin, 1933. Pp. 138. \$1.00. This book contains "Witchcraft in the Novels of Sir Walter Scott" by M. Boatright; "An Unsigned Poem by Mirabeau Lamar" by P. Graham; "Boyse's 'Albion's Triumph'" by R. H. Griffith; "Spenser and the Earlier Pastoral Elegy" and "Spenser and Shelley's 'Adonais'" by T. P. Harrison, Jr.; "Two Shakespearian Pictures of Puritans" by R. A. Law; "Two Sources of Poe's 'Arthur Gordon Pym'" by D. M. McKeithan; "Sir Thomas Elyot and the 'Sayings of the Philosophers'" by D. T. Starnes; and "More about Queen Elizabeth's Euphuism" by T. Stenberg.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

**Abrams, M. H.**—The milk of paradise. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press [*London*: Humphrey Milford], 1934. Pp. xii + 86. (Harvard Honors Theses in English, 7.)

**Ardill, J. R.**—Ireland in St. Paul's Time. *Dublin*: Church of Ireland Printing and Publishing Co., 1933. Pp. 29. 6 d.

**Dickens, B. and Ross, A. S. C. (eds.)**.—Dream of the rood. *London*: Methuen, 1934. Pp. xii + 50. 2 s. (Methuen's Old English Library.)

**Grierson, H. J. C. and Bullough, G. (eds.)**.—Oxford book of seventeenth century verse. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1934. Pp. xiv + 974. \$3.00.

**Huntington Library**.—Bulletin, number 6, November, 1934. Pp. 171. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1934.

**Keller, Wolfgang and Heckt, Hans (eds.)**.—Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 70. *Leipzig*: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. iv + 248.

**Marshall, Roderick**.—Italy in English Literature. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1934. Pp. xiv + 432. \$3.50. (Columbia U. Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 116.)

**Schmidt, Wolfgang**.—Neuphilologie als auslandswissenschaft auf der grundlage des sprachstudiums. *Marburg*: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1934. Pp. 52. 1 M.

**Schork, Walther**.—Dramenpläne Miltons. *Quakenbrück*: C. Trute, 1934. Pp. xiv + 92. M. 2.50. (Freiburger diss.)

**Serjeantson, Mary (ed.)**.—Annual bibliography of English language and literature, XIII. *Cambridge*: Bowes and Bowes, 1934. Pp. x + 265. 7/6.

**Shakespeare, William**.—Hamlet. Edited by J. Dover Wilson. *Cambridge*: U. Press [*New York*: Macmillan], 1934. Pp. cex + 290. \$2.50. (The New Shakespeare.)

## GERMAN

**Anneck, Wilhelm**.—Max Dauthendey als Dramatiker. Diss. Halle. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1934. viii, 98 pp. M. 2.50.

**Baumgarten, Hugo**.—Der sogenannte Wartburgkrieg. Diss. Göttingen. *Hoya (Weser)*: Petzold [1934]. 101 pp.

**Bertram, Ernst**.—Deutsche Gestalten. Fest- und Gedenkreden. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag, 1934. 279 pp. M. 6.

**Bondi, Georg**.—Erinnerungen an Stefan

George. Mit einer Bibliographie. *Berlin*: Bondi, 1934. 31 pp. M. 1.20.

**Brieger, Auguste**.—Kain und Abel in der deutschen Dichtung. [Stoff- und Motivgeschichte der deutschen Literatur. 14]. *Leipzig*: de Gruyter, 1934. 76 pp. M. 4.

**Buchberger, Sigmund**.—Beiträge zur Volkskunde der Namengebung in Altbayern und der Oberpfalz. Von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1500. Diss. *Freiburg i. B.*: 1934. 108 pp.

**Bürkler, Roberta-Maria**.—Die katholische Literatur der deutschen Schweiz von 1918 bis 1930. Diss. *Freiburg, Schweiz*: 1933. 146 pp.

**Dabrock, Joseph**.—Die christliche Legende und ihre Gestaltung in moderner deutscher Dichtung als Grundlage einer Typologie der Legende. Diss. Bonn. Teildruck. *Düren*: 1934. 74, vii pp.

**Dietrich, Rudolf**.—Hilfsbuch für deutsche Ortsnamenkunde. [*Eisenach*: Kühner, 1934]. 20 pp. M. 1.

**Diez, Max**.—Introduction to German. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934. ix, 409 pp. \$1.75.

**Ecker, Lawrence**.—Arabischer, provenzalischer und deutscher Minnesang. Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung. *Bern, Leipzig*: Haupt, 1934. iv, 236 pp. M. 6.

**Falkenheim, Hugo**.—Goethe und Hegel. [Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte. 26]. *Tübingen*: Mohr, 1934. vi, 84 pp. M. 4.50.

**Fiesel, Ludolf**.—Ortsnamenforschung und frühmittelalterliche Siedlung in Niedersachsen. [Teuthonista. Beiheft 9]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. 36 pp. 4°. M. 2.40.

**Fischer, Heinz**.—Die Frauenmonologe der deutschen höfischen Lyrik. Diss. *Marburg, Mainz*: Schneider, 1934. 62 pp.

**Franke, Erich**.—Gestalten der Tierdichtung. Diss. *Bonn*: Schäfershoven, 1934. 82 pp.

**Goethe, J. W. von**.—Ur-Xenien. Nach der Hs. des Goethe- u. Schiller-Archivs in Faks. Nachbildung hrsg. von Hans Wahl. [Schriften der Goethe-Ges. Bd. 47]. *Weimar*: Goethe-Ges., 1934. 15 pp. 14 plates.

**Goethe-Kalender** auf das Jahr 1935. Herausgegeben vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. *Leipzig*: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 240 pp.

**Gruber, Otto**.—Herder und Abbt. Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte des 18. Jh. Diss. *Marburg*. *Düsseldorf*: Nolte, 1934. viii, 51 pp.

**Günther, Werner**.—Der ewige Gotthelf. *Erlenbach-Zürich*: Rentsch [1934]. 400 pp. M. 6.80.

**Hahnel, Kurt.**—Sprachliche Untersuchung zur Alexius-Handschrift "7." Diss. Jena. *Coburg*: Rossteuhscher, 1934. 66 pp.

**Hans, Maria.**—Die religiöse Weltanschauung der Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1934. 69 pp.

**Heise, Lisa.**—Meine Briefe an Rainer Maria Rilke. *Berlin*: Rabenpresse [1934]. 58 pp. M. 1.50.

**Hensz, Rudolf.**—Studien zu Hans Folz. [Germanische Studien, H. 156]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 221 pp. M. 9.

**Hoppe, Else.**—Liebe und Gestalt. Der Typus des Mannes in der Dichtung der Frau. *Leipzig*: C. Fr. Fleischer, 1934. 304 pp. M. 4.50.

**Hotzenköcherle, Rudolf.**—Die Mundart von Mutten. Laut- u. Flexionslehre. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Gramm. 19). *Frauenfeld*: Huber, 1934. 540 pp. Fr. 16.

**Huch, Ricarda.**—Persönlichkeit und Werk in Darstellungen ihrer Freunde. *Berlin*: Atlantis-Verlag [1934]. 173 pp. 4°. M. 3.75.

**Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts** Frankfurt am Main 1932/1933. Im Auftrag der Verwaltung hrsg. von Ernst Beutler. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. 380 pp. 16 plates.

**Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft.** Im Auftrag des Vorstandes hrsg. von Max Hecker. Bd. 20 (1933). *Weimar*: Goethe-Ges., 1934. vi, 288 pp. 4 plates.

**Josephson geb. Böckler, Gisela.**—Die mhd. Vernovelle von Aristoteles und Phyllis. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1934. 96 pp.

**Just, Hildegard.**—Der Hirschberger Dichterkreis, ein Beitrag zur schlesischen Literaturgeschichte in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jhs. Diss. *Breslau*: 1934. 94 pp.

**Kicherer, Wilhelm.**—Eichenorff und die Presse. Diss. *Heidelberg*. *Bruchsal*: Kruse, 1934. 98 pp.

**Köhler, Otto.**—Die Flexion in der Mundart von Aschenroth. Diss. *Würzburg*: [1934]. 58 pp. 3 plates.

**Könitzer, Willi Fr.**—Hölderlin. Ein Schicksal in Deutschland. *Oldenburg*: Stalling [1934]. 61 pp. M. 1.20.

**Kuttner, Gerhard.**—Wesen und Formen der deutschen Schwankliteratur des 16. Jhs. [Germanische Studien, H. 152]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 111 pp. M. 4.40.

**Laaths, Erwin.**—Der Nationalliberalismus im Werke Gustav Freytags. Diss. *Köln*: 1934. viii, 123 pp.

**Leimbach, Friedrich.**—Die Sprache Notkers und Willrams. Dargelegt in Notkers Psalter und Willrams Hohem Lied. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1933. 123 pp.

**Leiss, Ludwig.**—Bayerische Familiennamen und Rechtsgeschichte. Diss. *München*

[Südostbayerische Heimatstudien. Bd. 10]. *Hirschenhausen*: 1934. 128 pp.

**Lübbert, Gert Ulrich.**—Das Gemeinschaftserlebnis im deutschen Drama seit der Klassik. Diss. Rostock. *Jena*: Neuenhahn, 1934. xii, 46 pp.

**Marienlob,** Das rheinische. Eine deutsche Dichtung des 13. Jhs. Hrsg. von Adolf Bach. [Bibl. des Liter. Ver. Stuttgart, 281]. *Leipzig*: Hiersemann, 1934. lxxv, 231 pp. M. 14.

**Matthey, Anny.**—Über die Kunst des Gestaltens in der erzählenden Dichtung Jakob Schaffners. Diss. Marburg. *Kempen a. Rh.*: Thomas-Druckerei, 1934. 84 pp.

**Michel, Kurt.**—Das Wesen des Reformationdramas entwickelt am Stoff des verlorenen Sohns. Diss. Giessen. *Düren*: Spezial-Dissertations-Druckerei, 1934. 34 pp.

**Moser, Georg.**—Studien zur Dialektgeographie des Staudengebietes und des anstossenden Lechrains. Diss. *Freiburg i. B.*: 1930. 80 pp., map.

**Müllerbach, Herbert.**—Kleine Einführung in die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart. [Leipzig: Maier, 1934]. 80 pp. M. 1.

**Niemeyer, Wolfgang.**—Goethe und Wiedland. [65. u. 66. Jahresbericht über das städtische Reformrealgymnasium Zwickau]. *Zwickau*: Zwickauer Zeitung, 1934. 24, 29 pp. 4°.

**Oberkampf, Walter.**—Die zeitungskundliche Bedeutung der moralischen Wochenschriften, ihr Wesen und ihre Bedeutung. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1934. 127 pp.

**Otfried.**—Evangelienbuch. Hrsg. von O. Erdmann. 2. Aufl., besorgt von Edward Schröder. Textabdruck mit Quellenangaben u. Wörterbuch. [Sammlung germanist. Hilfsmittel für den prakt. Studienzweck. 1]. *Halle*: Waisenhaus, 1934. xii, 311 pp. M. 7.

**Pansch, Otto-Wilhelm.**—Ludwig Uhland. Neue Studien zur romantischen Mythologie. *Düsseldorf*: G. H. Nolte, 1934. vii, 67 pp. M. 2.80.

**Pfeiffer-Belli, Wolfgang.**—Mönche und Ritter, Bürger und Bauern im deutschen Epos des Spätmittelalters. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Klostermann, 1934. 190 pp. M. 7.

**Pickering, Frederick P.**—Die Sprache der Heidelberger Hs [H] von Gottfried von Straßburgs Tristan. Diss. *Breslau*. *Ohlau i. Schl.*: Eschenhagen, 1934. 103 pp.

**Plathow, Gerhard.**—Das Wahrheitsproblem in Goethes Wissenschaft. [Germanische Studien, H. 155]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 150 pp. M. 6.

**Pongs, Hermann.**—Krieg als Volksschicksal im deutschen Schrifttum. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Gegenwart. [Er-

weitert aus: Dichtung und Volkstum. Bd. 35, 1 u. 2]. *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1934. 91 pp. M. 2.85.

Rahn-Bechmann, Lilli.—Der Darmstädter Freundeskreis. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der empfindsamen Seelenhaltung des 18. Jh. Diss. *Erlangen*: Döres, 1934. iv, 69 pp.

Rilke, Rainer Maria.—Briefe an seinen Verleger 1906 bis 1926. Hrsg. von Ruth Sieber-Rilke u. Carl Sieber. *Leipzig*: Insel, 1934. 479 pp. M. 7.

Röttger, Hedwig.—Das Motiv: Der heimkehrende Gatte u. s. Weib in der deutschen Literatur seit 1890. [Diss. Auszug]. *Bonn*: Neuendorf, 1934. vii, 120 pp.

Rosenfeld, Beate.—Die Golemsage und ihre Verwertung in der deutschen Literatur. [Sprache und Kultur der german. u. roman. Völker. B, Bd. 5]. *Breslau*: Priebsch, 1934. ix, 183 pp. M. 8.

Rüdiger, Horst.—Geschichte der deutschen Sappho-Übersetzungen. [Germanische Studien. H. 151] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 51 pp. M. 2.20.

Schaefer, Ernst Joachim.—Herders Schrift "Gott" und ihre Aufnahme bei Goethe. Diss. Marburg. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 67 pp.

Scheid, Paul.—Studien zum spanischen Sprachgut im Deutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Wortforschung. Diss. *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1934. 135 pp.

Schmidt, Karl.—Die Hausnamen und Hauszeichen des mittelalterlichen Freiburg. Diss. *Freiburg i. B.*: 1934. 149 pp.

Schneider, Thekla.—Im Canne der Droste. *Friedrichshafen*: See-Verlag [1934]. 47 pp. M. 1.50.

Schwarz, Peter Paul.—Dichtung und Politik. Versuch einer soziologischen Darstellung der Beziehungen zwischen Dichtung und Politik im Deutschland der Nachkriegszeit. Diss. Heidelberg. *Ludwigshafen a Rh.*: Waldkirch [1934]. 47 pp.

Signer, Leutfrid.—Die Predigtanlage bei P. Michael Angelus von Schorno, O. M. Cap. (1631-1712). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Barockschrifttums. Diss. *Freiburg, Schweiz*: 1933. xvi, 151 pp.

Spinner, Heinrich.—Goethes Typusbegriff. Diss. Teildruck. *Zürich*: 1933. iv, 131 pp.

Stucki, Klara.—Grimmelshausens Josephsroman. Diss. Teildruck. *Zürich*: 1933. iv, 79 pp.

Sybel-Petersen, Adelheid von.—Albert Steffen. Wesen u. Werk. Mit Albert Steffens Porträt u. Autogramm. *Basel*: Geering, 1934. 147 pp. M. 4.

Tschärner, Eduard Horst von.—China in der deutschen Dichtung. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin*: 1934. 63 pp. 4°.

Tschech, Johannes.—Dietzenschmidt, ein Dramatiker der Gegenwart. Mit einem Geleitwort von Herbert Cysarz. *Leipzig*: [C. Fr. Fleischer, 1934]. 132 pp. M. 2.50.

Vogele, Heinrich.—Georg Büchner und Shakespeare. Diss. Marburg. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1934. vi, 55 pp.

Vogt, Friedrich, u. Koch, Max.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 5. Aufl. Neubearb. u. erweitert von Willi Koch. Bd. 2: Vom Anfang d. 18. Jh. bis zum Ende der bürgerlichen Epigonendichtung. (1700-1890). Von Max Koch u. Willi Koch. *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Institut, 1934. xi, 459 pp., 8 plates, 5 facsimiles, 4°. M. 9.50.

Waldmann, Elisabeth.—Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Ethos und Bildungswelt. Diss. Heidelberg. *Borna-Leipzig*: Noske, 1934. vi, 133 pp.

Wallenstein, Paul R.—Die dichterische Gestaltung der historischen Persönlichkeit, gezeigt an der Wallensteinfigur. Ein Versuch zur Beleuchtung der Problematik von Dichtung und Geschichte unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Wertbegegnung. Diss. Bonn. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1934. 82 pp. M. 2.50.

Weber, Liselotte.—Frank Wedekind, Der Marquis von Keith. Der Abenteurer in dramatischer Gestaltung. Diss. Kiel. *Quakenbrück*: Kleinert, 1934. 72 pp.

Weiss, Richard.—Das Alpenerebnis in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Teildruck. *Zürich*: 1933. iv, 53 pp.

Wibbelt, Augustin.—Des Dichters Leben und Werk. Hrsg. von Wilhelm Bachmann. *Bonn*: Buchgemeinde. 1934. 160 pp. M. 2.70.

Wolfheim, Hans.—Sinn und Deutung der Sonett-Gestaltung im Werk Eichendorffs. Diss. *Hamburg*: 1933. 85 pp.

Zinecker, Rudolf.—Deutsche Grossstadtlyrik (1910-1930). Mit bes. Berücksichtigung des Expressionismus 1910-1914. Hrsg. mit Unterstützung des Ministeriums für Schulwesen und Volkskultur. *Reichenberg*: Stiepel, 1934. 41 pp. Kf. 6.

Zorb, Elizabeth, H.—Religiöse Strömungen in der schlesischen Dichtung der Gegenwart. [Sammlung Heitz. Reihe 10, Bd. 1]. *Leipzig*: Heitz & Cie., 1934. 120 pp. 4°. M. 4.

#### FRENCH

Allen, J. E. and M. Deschamps-Monpeurt.—En Route. *New York*: Am. Bk. Co., 1934. xiv + 222 pp.

Arbalet, P.—Stendhal au pays des comédiennes. *Grenoble*: Arthaud, 1934. 200 pp.

Balzac.—Eugénie Grandet, éd. Cl. Jamet. *Paris*: Hachette, 1934. lx + 292 pp.

Barjavel.—Colette à la recherche de



*l'amour. Paris: Orobitz, 1934. 48 pp. Fr. 4.50.*

**Brugmans, H.**—G. de Porto-Riche. *Paris: Droz, 1934. 369 pp. Fr. 50.*

**Brunot, F.**—Hist. de la langue fr. VIII. Le français hors de Fr. au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s. *Paris: Colin, 1934. xlv + 768 pp.*

**Chaigne, L.**—Vies et œuvres d'écrivains. Mme de Noailles, Valéry, Claudel, Gide, Proust, Maurois, Benoit, Mauriac. *Paris: Eds. P. Bossuet, 1934. 239 pp.*

**Cornelia, W. B.**—The Classical Sources of the Nature References in Ronsard's Poetry. *New York: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1934. 238 pp.*

**Delcourt, Marie.**—La Tradition des comiques anciens en Fr. avant Molière. *Paris: Droz, 1934. 97 pp. (Bibl. de l'Univ. de Liège.)*

**Engel et Vallot.**—Les Ecrivains de la Montagne, 1650-1810. *Paris: Delagrave, 1934. 320 pp.*

**Heywood, J.**—L'Angleterre dans l'œuvre de V. Hugo. *Paris: Droz, 1934. iii + 245 pp.*

**Loftus, E. M. T.**—Reflets étranges. *New York: Am. Bk. Co., 1934. x + 203 pp.*

**Michel, Ed.**—André Rivoire, le poète, sa vie, son œuvre. *Vienne: Blanchard, 1932. iv + 119 pp.*

**Michelet.**—Extraits, éd. Ph. Van Tieghem. *Paris: Hachette, 1934. 428 pp.*

**Pellegrini, Silvio.**—Il "Pianto" anonimo provenzale per Roberto d'Angiò. *Turin: Ed. Chiantore, 1934. 100 pp.*

**Quinet, E.**—Extraits, éd. J. Boudout. *Paris: Hatier, 1934. 96 pp.*

**Racine.**—Théâtre, éd. D. Mornet [plays also published separately]. *Paris: Mellottée, 1934. xxvi + 958 pp.*

**Rouché, J.**—La Mise en scène de "Don Juan." *Paris: Durand, 1934. 54 pp. Fr. 5.*

**Wais, K.**—Das antiphilosophische Weltbild des franz. Sturm und Drang, 1760-89. *Berlin: Junker u. Dünhaupt, 1934. 162 pp. M. 9.*

**Wartburg, W. von.**—Bibliog. des dictionnaires patois. *Paris: Droz, 1934. 147 pp.*

**Wilson, R. MacNair.**—Mme de Staël. *Paris: Payot, 1934. 368 pp. Fr. 20.*

### ITALIAN

**Alfieri, Vittorio.**—L'Agamennone. Con introduzione e commento a cura di C. Jorio. *Milano: C. Signorelli, 1933. 77 pp. L. 3. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 31.)*

—Il Saul. Con argomenti, commentario dichiarativo e giudizi a ciascun atto dei migliori critici dell'arte alferiana. A cura di R. Guastalla. *Milano: C. Signorelli, 1933. 70 pp. L. 3.*

**Alighieri, Dante.**—La Divina Commedia, con l'introduzione e il commento di E. Camerini. *Milano: Sonzogno, 1933. 430 pp. L. 4. (Biblioteca classica economica, n. 1.)*

**Aurelio, A.**—Uomini, leggende e canti di Dalmazia. *Roma: "Dalmazia," 1933. 59 pp. L. 3. (Collezione dalmatica.)*

**Baldi, R.**—Saggi storici introduttivi alle "Farse cavajole." *Napoli: A. Guida, 1933. 133 pp. L. 6.*

—Studi e ricerche di letteratura italiana. Da Dante al Croce. *Napoli: A. Guida, 1933. 135 pp. L. 6.*

**Baldini, A.**—Ludovico della tranquillità. Divagazioni ariostesche. *Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 122 pp. L. 8.*

**Bentini, G.**—L'anima di Giovanni Pascoli. *Napoli: Ediz. "La Toga," 1933. 26 pp. L. 5.*

**Bertoldi, A.**—Il canto XI del Paradiso, letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1932. 62 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)*

**Berzero, G.**—Nuove pagine di critica. Jacopone, Dante, Petrarca, Pulci, Machiavelli, Parini, Leopardi, Pellico, Nievo, Borsi. *Chiavari: G. Esposito, 1933. 213 pp. L. 7.50.*

**Campagnoli, A.**—Pavia intellettuale. *Cuneo: G. Franchino, 1933. 195 pp.*

**Caverzan, G.**—I nostri grandi. Piccole biografie di scrittori, artisti e letterati. *Milano: "Vita scolastica," 1933. 197 pp. L. 7. (Il libro del maestro elementare, IV.)*

**Colucci, Edith Southwell.**—Canti popolari corsi. Raccolti da —. *Livorno: R. Giusti, 1933. xxi + 233 pp. L. 18.*

**De Lisa, G.**—Carducci poeta d'amore. Saggio. *Brindisi: Tip. La Moderna, 1933. 44 pp. L. 4.*

**De Sanctis, Francesco.**—La letteratura italiana nel secolo decimonono. Vol. I-IV. *Napoli: A. Morano, 1930-33. 4 vols., xii + 352, 457, 241, 412. L. 16, 20, 12, 18. (Opere complete, III-VI.)*

—Saggi critici. Nuova edizione a cura di N. Cortese. *Napoli: A. Morano, 1933. x + 345 pp. L. 12.*

—Storia della letteratura italiana. Nuova edizione, riveduta e corretta. Vol. I. *Milano: Sonzogno, 1933. 391 pp. L. 4. (Biblioteca classica economica, n. 126.)*

**Di Malio, D.**—Dalla storia all'arte. Note ed appunti. *Cerignola: Tip. B. Abate, 1933. 58 pp.*

**Fрати, C.**—Dizionario bio-bibliografico dei bibliotecari e bibliofili italiani dal secolo XIV al XIX. Raccolto e pubblicato da A. Sorbelli. *Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1933. viii + 707 pp. L. 150. (Biblioteca di biblio-*



grafia italiana, diretta da A. Sorbelli. Supplementi periodici a *La Bibliofilia*, XIII.)

**Giordani, Pietro.**—Lettere inedite al p. Antonio Fania da Rignano (Puglie) dei frati minori. A cura del p. F. Sarri. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 197 pp. L. 8.

**Giusso, L.**—Leopardi, Stendhal, Nietzsche. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1933. 263 pp. L. 8.

**Grasselli, G.**—Caratteri! (A. Peretti; D. Panizzi.) *Reggio-Emilia*: F. Guidetti, 1933. v + 118 pp.

**Gustarelli, A.**—Il seicento. Rapide analisi della vita spirituale e letteraria. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1933. 52 pp. L. 2. (Quaderni di analisi estetica.)

**Leopardi, Giacomo.**—I canti. Introduzione e note di V. Piccoli. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1933. xviii + 286 pp. L. 6.50. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

—Operette morali, seguite da una scelta dei "Pensieri." Studio introduttivo e commento di M. Fubini. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 321 pp. L. 12. (Classici italiani commentati.)

**Lucca, G.**—Quadri sinottici della storia letteraria d'Italia. *Torino*: Soc. editr. internazionale, 1933. viii + 102 pp. L. 2.50.

**Luiso, F. P.**—Il canto XXI del Paradiso letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. 68 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

**Manzoni, Alessandro.**—Gli inni sacri e le odi. Con note ad uso delle scuole per cura di F. Zublena. *Torino*: Soc. editr. internazionale, 1933. 79 pp. L. 2.

—Osservazioni sulla morale cattolica. *Alba-Roma*: Pia soc. S. Paolo, 1933. 310 pp. L. 5.

**Mazzatinti, G., Menghini, M., Natali, G.**—Bibliografia leopardiana. Parte II (1898-1930), per cura e con prefazione di G. Natali. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1932. viii + 304 pp. L. 80. (Biblioteca di bibliografia italiana, diretta da A. Sorbelli. Supplementi periodici a *La Bibliofilia*, XII.)

**Montemayor, G. de.**—Onoranze a Basilio Puoti promosse dal municipio di Arienzo. S. Felice, MCMXXXII, X. Commemorazione letta da E. Guerriero. *Napoli*: Coop. tip. sanitaria, 1933. 38 pp.

**Muscetta, C.**—Studi desanctisiani. Scritti di B. Croce, E. Cione, C. Muscetta. A cura di —. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1931. 93 pp. L. 10. (Quaderni storici, I.)

**Negri, L.**—Carlo Denina, un accademico piemontese del '700. Sulla scorta di documenti inediti. *Torino*: F.lli Bocca, 1933. 4to., 160 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Memorie della r. Accademia delle scienze di Torino,"

serie II, vol. LXVII, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche.)

**Olschki, L.**—La poesia italiana del cinquecento. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1933. 64 pp. L. 6.

**Palmieri, E. F.**—Bene gli altri. Cronache drammatiche. *Bologna*: Ediz. Aldine, 1933. 246 pp. L. 10.

**Pellico, Silvio.**—Le mie prigionie. Aggiuntivi i capitoli inediti ed illustrate da T. Johannot. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1933. 236 pp. L. 6.

**Petrarca, Francesco.**—L'Africa, in versi italiani di A. Barolo. Con introduzione. *Torino*: G. Chiantore, 1933. xl + 309 pp. L. 20.

—Le Familiari. Edizione critica per cura di V. Rossi. Volume I. Introduzione e libri I-IV. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1933. clxxii + 204 pp. L. 50. (Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca.)

**Petrobono, L.**—Il canto XIX del Paradiso letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1932. 36 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

**Pompeati, A.**—Ariosto. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1933. 286 pp. L. 15. (Le Scie.)

**Pratella, F. B.**—Romagna intima. Con illustrazioni originali. *Lugo*: Tip. Ferretti, 1933. 115 pp. L. 10.

**Receputo Gulizia, G.**—Cenni storici su Mineo, con biografie d'illustri meneini. *Noto*: Tip. Zammit, 1933. 210 pp.

**Romagnano, D.**—Nostro idioma. Linee di grammatica italiana. *Salerno*: Di Giacomo, 1933. 59 pp. L. 3.

**Rossi, G.**—Amore e morte nella poesia di Giovanni Pascoli. *Lanciano*: Tip. Masciangelo, 1933. 129 pp. L. 5.

**Rossi, V.**—Il Quattrocento. 3a edizione completamente rifatta. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1933. xiii + 574 pp. L. 50. (Storia letteraria d'Italia.)

**Saba, A.**—Federico Borromeo e i mistici del suo tempo, con la vita e la corrispondenza inedita di Caterina Vannini da Siena. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. xxxii + 280 pp. (Fontes Ambrosiani in lucem editi cura et studio Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, moderante J. Galbiati, VII.)

**Sammartano, Lucia.**—Il sentimento della natura e il sentimento della fede nella vita e nelle opere di Francesco Petrarca. *Trapani*: Tip. "La Combattente," 1933. 151 pp.

**Segneri, Paolo.**—Dal "Quaresimale." Prediche scelte con introduzione e note a cura di E. Filippini. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 123 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 43.)

**Spongano, R.**—La poetica del sensismo e

la poesia di Parini. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1933. viii + 127 pp. L. 10.

Toffanin, G.—Storia dell'umanesimo: dal XIII al XVI secolo. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1933. 339 pp. L. 15.

Torchia, A.—Il primo canto del Purgatorio. Interpretazione estetica. *Catanzaro*: Stab. tip. Moderno, 1933. 14 pp.

Vida, Marco Girolamo.—Il "Giucoco degli scacchi" (Scacchia ludus). Con prefazione e traduzione di G. Moroncini. *Napoli*: S. I. E. M., 1933. 55 pp.

Zingarelli, N.—Il canto XXIX dell'Inferno letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1932. 47 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

### SPANISH

Alexandre, El libro de, texts . . . prepared with an introd. by R. S. Willis, Jr. *Princeton*: University Press, 1934. xi + 461 pp. (Elliott Monographs, 32.)

Arias Sanjurjo, J.—De la aventura que a Sancho y Don Quijote sucedió con un cuerpo muerto. *Santiago [de Compostela]*: Paredes, 1934. 26 pp. 1 pta.

Caravaglios, B.—El "Canto a Teresa," por José de Espronceda. *Apuntes. Napoli*: Ist. Napoletano di Cultura, 1933. 79 pp. 5 ls.

Cervantes.—Don Chisciotte. Nuova trad. di F. Carlesi. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1934. 50 ls.

—Don Quixote. Trans. by J. Ormsby. *New York*: Lim. Eds. Club, 1933. 2 vols. 840 pp.

Coplas y romances que cantan los mozos en algunos pueblos de Castilla la Vieja con motivo de las bodas, de la Cuaresma, de las fiestas de Pascuas y de otras festividades, recogidos por G. Ma. Vergara Martín. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1934. 253 pp. 4 ptas. (Biblioteca Folklórica Española.)

Cossío, J. Ma. de.—La obra literaria de Pereda. Su historia, su crítica. *Santander*: Soc. Menéndez y Pelayo, 1934. 410 pp. 6 ptas.

Cruz, San Juan de la.—The Complete Works of Saint John of the Cross. Trans. and ed. by E. A. Peers. *London*: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1934. Vol. I: lxxvii + 486 pp.

Englekirk, J. E.—Edgar Allan Poe in Hispanic Literature. *New York*: Inst. de las Españas, 1934. 504 pp.

Giménez Caballero, E.—El belén de Salzillo en Murcia. Origen de los nacimientos en España. *Madrid*: Eds. "Gaceta Literaria," 1934. 134 pp. 4 ptas.

Gimeno, P.—Cuentos de acá y de allá. Selected, adapted, and edited with notes, etc.

by. . . *New York*: Sanborn, 1934. viii + 200 pp.

González López, L.—Las mujeres de D. Juan Valera. *Madrid*: S. E. L. E., 1934. 296 pp. 5 ptas.

Ibn Tufayl.—El filósofo autodidacto. Nueva tr. española por A. González Palencia. *Madrid*: Escuela de Estudios Arabes, 1934. 201 pp. 5 ptas.

Jiménez Rueda, J.—Historia de la literatura mexicana. 2a ed. *México*: Botas, 1934. 323 pp.

Langenegger, A.—Des P. Pedro Malón de Chaide "Conversión de la Madalena." *Zurich*: Leemann, 1933. 107 pp.

Levi, E.—Il dramma spagnuolo, preludio dei "Promessi Sposi." *Napoli*: Ricciardi, 1934. 38 pp. 4 ls.

Marenduzzo, E.—José Cadalso e le "Cartas marruecas." Specchio della vita spagnuola del XVIII secolo. *Napoli*: A. Panaro, 1934. 47 pp.

Ochando, A.—Baladas del "Quijote." *Madrid*: Eds. Literatura, 1934. 135 pp. 4 ptas.

Pérez de Ayala.—Selections from. . . Ed. by N. B. Adams and S. A. Stoudemire. *New York*: Norton, 1934. xxxviii + 239 pp.

Romancero. — Selección hecha por G. Menéndez Pidal. *Madrid*: Instituto Escuela, 1933. 238 pp. 4 ptas.

Spanish One Act Plays in English, trans. by W. K. Jones. *Dallas*: Tardy, 1934. 296 pp.

Templin, E. H.—The Exculpation of "Yerros por amores" in the Spanish Comedia. *Berkeley*: Univ. of California, 1933. 49 pp.

The Modernist Trend in Spanish-American Poetry.—A Collection of representative Poems of the Modernist Movement and the Reaction. Trans. into English verse with a commentary by G. Dundas Craig. *Berkeley*: Univ. of California, 1934. xii + 347 pp. \$4.00.

Weisinger, N. L. and M. C. Johnston.—Los otros americanos. *New York*: Doubleday, 1934. xvi + 247 pp.

X.—The mystical doctrine of St. John of the Cross. An abridgement. *London*: Sheed & Ward, 1934. xxiv + 213 pp.

### GENERAL

Dahlerup, Verner.—Ordbyg over det danske Sprog XV. *Copenhagen*: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1934. 1450 cols.

Hughson and Gostick.—In Foreign Lands, an exploratory lang. course and cultural introd. to Rome, Italy, France, Spain, Germany. *Boston*: Heath, 1934. xvi + 362 pp. \$1.24.

# The English Literary and Educational Review for Continental Readers

**Officially Recommended. 1935. Sixth Year**

A quarterly paper of information for Teachers and Students of  
Modern English (Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter)

**Edited by Paul Hempel, Leipzig C 1, Wallwitz Strasse No. 8**

with the assistance of A. Lloyd James, Professor of Phonetics, London University, and Linguistic Adviser to the British Broadcasting Corporation, London, C. K. Ogden, Director of the Orthological Institute for the Promotion of Research on the Science of Language, London and Cambridge, and I. A. Richards, Litt. D., Magdalene College, Cambridge. Contributors: Cyril Aungier, Ashton, England; Mittelschullehrer Ludwig Bach, Halle (Saale); A. M. A. Bogaerts, Litt. Angl. Drs., Hilversum; Prof. J. Casadesus, Barcelona; Richard Colenutt, M. A., Lecturer of English, Berlin; Dr. Gerhard Dietrich, Gera; Stud.-Ass. Horst Dittmann, Chemnitz; Miss Gwen E. Evans, Bowdon (England); Grant C. S. Fairbairn, Lecturer of English, Kiel; Dr. Helmut Freytag, Gera; H. M. Hain, Ph. D., F. R. S. L., English Seminary for Foreign Students, Leamington Spa; Stud.-Ref. Walter Hermann, Eisenach; Studienrat Dr. Otto Hofmann, Chemnitz; Rektor A. Hoshcke, Halle (Saale); Dr. Fritz Huber, Wien; Studienrat Bruno Muschalek, Rosenberg; Prof. Francesco Pagliaretti, Livorno; Will Potter, Berlin; F. H. Pritchard, Lecturer at Westminster College, and Author, London; Mittelschullehrer H. Radecke, Güsten; Mittelschullehrer Dr. Kurt Richter, Halle; T. C. Roy, M. A., Lecturer at the University Berlin; Fräulein Dr. Hella Walzer, Studienrätin, Hindenburg; Alfred Weigt, Leipzig; Studienrat Dr. Friedrich Werner, Berlin; Studienrat Dr. Karl Ziern, Einbeck.

Subscription Rates: Annually RM. 2.75; six months RM. 1.50; single numbers 80 Pfennig each; payable in advance.

Contents: Various Essays on the Teaching of English, Language, Literature, History, Pronunciation. Many Reviews of Books of Importance to Teachers and Students of English.

**PAUL HEMPEL**

English Book Service

**Leipzig O 5**

Wallwitz Strasse 8

---

## A HISTORY OF FRENCH DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

### Part II. The Period of Corneille (1635-1651)

BY HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER

These two volumes are concerned with some 280 plays, written between the time when Corneille's first tragedy appeared and his temporary retirement from dramatic composition at the end of 1651. The period is that in which the theatre became, for the first time in modern France, the principal means of literary expression, in which a definite type of tragedy, differing from that of the Ancients and from those of the sixteenth century and of Racine, was created, in which tragi-comedy continued to flourish, and in which comedy became more and more significant. It contains certain works of great importance in the history of European culture and the germs of others that were to supersede them. *Two volumes, 804 pages, crown 8vo, \$10.00.*

#### PRESS COMMENTS UPON PART I

##### The Pre-Classical Period (1610-1634)

"Such a monument of industry as can only now be expected from scholars of a younger race. . . . The French classical period has left a deep and permanent impression upon the dramatic history of the modern world, and we find it here in the making."

*The Times Literary Supplement.*

"His new work fills one with admiration at its thoroughness and its scholarly workmanship . . . a remarkable book, to the excellences of which I hope I have served as a modest signpost."

*Modern Language Review.*

*Two volumes, 785 pages, crown 8vo, \$10.00.*

---

## WILLIAM BARTRAM

### INTERPRETER OF THE AMERICAN LANDSCAPE

BY N. BRYLLION FAGIN

TABLE OF CONTENTS. PART ONE—LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY: I. Life and Character, II. Philosophy of Nature, III. Studies of the American Indian; PART TWO—INTERPRETER OF THE AMERICAN LANDSCAPE: I. The Elements of Bartram's Landscape, II. The Art of Bartram; PART THREE—BARTRAM'S INFLUENCE ON LITERATURE: 1. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, 2. William Wordsworth, 3. Other English Writers, 4. American Literature, 5. Continental Writers; CONCLUSION; APPENDIX; BIBLIOGRAPHY; INDEX.

*241 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$2.25*

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

---







*Presenting*

## ROMANTICISTS, PURITANS, BENTHAMITES AND A PREACHER

But not, of course, all at once. In four new Columbia University Press publications, however, these individuals and movements of so much importance to English literature and thought are given the scholarly and engaging treatment they deserve.

A good example is *Italy in English Literature, 1755-1815*, which is by Roderick Marshall, and is the first complete study of the origins of the Romantic interest in Italy. Mr. Marshall has covered the whole subject with appropriate discrimination.

Shifting from the Romanticists to a 17th Century character of great fame, there is *John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher* by William York Tindall. New light is shed on this noted author, for he and his work are considered in relation to the social and economic background. In addition, the author has uncovered much new material. Here is the actual Bunyan.

The Puritans are well represented by William Haller's *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-47*. Prof. Haller has edited this three volume work with care and consideration for the great mass of subject matter from which he had to choose. Volume I is Dr. Haller's commentary, while the other two are facsimiles of many noted tracts.

The fourth book is *Benthamite Reviewing*, which is by George L. Nesbitt and is a study of more than academic interest of the first twelve years of the *Westminster Review*—when it was the organ of the Benthamites and had among its contributors James and John Stuart Mill.

The coupon below is for use in ordering any of these unique studies. All have an unassailable place in the field of literature.

---

### COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Box A 178, 2960 Broadway, New York City

Please send me ( ) for payment enclosed ( ) C. O. D. ( ) charged to my account, the following:

- ( ) ITALY IN ENGLISH LITERATURE, 1755-1815—\$3.50.
- ( ) JOHN BUNYAN, MECHANICK PREACHER—\$3.50.
- ( ) TRACTS ON LIBERTY IN THE PURITAN REVOLUTION—3 Vols.  
\$12.50 (not sold separately).
- ( ) BENTHAMITE REVIEWING—\$2.75.
- ( ) Also, please send me free of charge *Columbia Books, 1893-1933*, the modern dictionary-catalogue listing all Columbia publications.

Name.....

Address.....

## Our Anniversary—1885—1935



Fifty years of meeting and anticipating the textbook requirements of teachers in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities.

*Publishers of Heath Modern Language Series*



**D. C. Heath and Company**

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

ATLANTA

SAN FRANCISCO

DALLAS

LONDON

### A NEW SPANISH READER

by H. E. Ford and Juan Cano, *University of Toronto*

"We are all enthusiastic about it. The material is excellent and well presented. The method advocated seems pedagogically sound, and we are using it as our next book in first year Spanish, feeling it will help create a reading ability."

W. K. Jones, *Miami University*

List Price: 96 cents

### TALES OF THE SPANISH SOUTHWEST

by W. V. Smith, *Sacramento Junior College*, and  
R. L. Grismer, *University of Minnesota*

"The texts are ably written and exceedingly interesting. I am very much attracted also by the pedagogical paraphernalia that goes along with each text. They should assure careful reading and good vocabulary memorization."

Harry Kurtz, *University of Nebraska*

List Price: 96 cents

### PARDO BAZÁN: SHORT STORIES

Edited by Albert Shapiro, *Belmont Hill School*, and  
F. J. Hurley, *George Washington High School*, N. Y. C.

The only representative collection of this author's short stories now available in America. The stories are well edited and attractively presented.

List Price: 92 cents

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, 1 Park Ave., New York